

***NEW DIRECTIONS IN PARKS AND PROTECTED AREAS:
OPPORTUNITIES FOR U.S.-EUROPEAN COOPERATION AND
EXCHANGE***

11-15 June 2001

**USNPS Northeast Region, Philadelphia, Brandywine Valley, and
Valley Forge National Historical Park, Pennsylvania**

***INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP:
THE FUTURE OF ISCN/USNPS AGREEMENT***

11 June 2001

USNPS Northeast Region, Philadelphia

***WORKING SESSION:
MANAGING CULTURAL LANDSCAPES AND DEALING WITH LOCAL COMMUNITIES: NEW
STRATEGIES AND PERSPECTIVES***

12-15 June 2001

**Brandywine Valley, Pennsylvania and
Valley Forge National Historical Park, Pennsylvania**

**Convened by the US National Park Service Northeast Region and
the Conservation Study Institute
in cooperation with QLF/Atlantic Center for the Environment
in partnership with Federico Niccolini**

SUMMARY REPORT

Prepared by Nora Mitchell, Federico Niccolini, and Gay Vietzke

Final Version 26 April 2002

For additional information, contact:

National Park Service Conservation Study Institute

P.O. Box 178

Woodstock, VT 05091 USA

(802) 457-3368

stewardship@nps.gov

www.nps.gov/mabi/csi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2 BACKGROUND FOR THE MEETING.....	2
3 GOALS AND MAIN RESULTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP: THE FUTURE OF THE ISCN- USNPS AGREEMENT - 11 JUNE 2001....	4
4 GOALS AND MAIN RESULTS OF THE WORKING SESSION – 12-15 JUNE 2001.....	5
A. KEY CONSERVATION THEMES	5
A1) Stewardship Education.....	6
A2) Linking Biodiversity and Cultural Diversity	6
A3) Balancing Protection and Sustainable Development	7
A4) Co-Management and Partnerships	7
5 NEXT STEPS - IDEAS FOR TRANS-ATLANTIC COLLABORATION	9
A. PROPOSED PROGRAM UNDER ISCN-USNPS AGREEMENT.....	9
A1. ISCN-USNPS Agreement.....	9
B. COOPERATION WITH EUROPARC.....	11
B1. Develop a Partnership Program for Exchange (based on the Europarc model)	11
B2. Europarc-USNPS/NER Cooperation (proposed Agreement)	11
C. CONSERVATION LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT.....	12
C1. New Leadership Skills for a New Era of Conservation.....	12
C2. Leadership Development – Bi-Lateral Study Tours.....	12
D. LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION EXCHANGES.....	13
D1. International Symposium on Trans-boundary Heritage Areas/Corridors.....	13
D2. Greenways Exchange	13

D3. Study Program for Community Integration in Protected Area Management	14
D4. Presentations at George Wright Society Conference, San Diego, 2003.....	15
E. RESEARCH ON NEW DIRECTIONS IN CONSERVATION.....	15
E1. Participatory Research on Best Practices for Collaborative Approaches to Landscape Conservation.....	15
E2. Research on Costs and Benefits of Protected Area Designation.....	16
E3. Research on Environmental Valuation	17
F. STEWARDSHIP EDUCATION.....	17
F1. Establish a Joint US-Italy Training Program on Environmental Education.....	17
F2. Develop Common Methods for Interpretive Planning	18
G. EXCHANGE ON CURRENT CONSERVATION ISSUES.....	18
G1. International Conference on Regeneration of Rural Communities through Protected Areas/Landscapes.....	18
G2. Workshop on Methods and Strategies for the Reduction of the Impacts of Traffic in Protected Areas	19
G3. The Conservation Use of Military Areas	19
6 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS AND STARTING POINT FOR FUTURE WORK.....	20
ATTACHMENT I - USNPS – ISCN AGREEMENT	21
ATTACHMENT II – PARTICIPANTS LIST AND PEOPLE INVITED BUT UNABLE TO ATTEND	23
ATTACHMENT III - RESPONSES TO THE PRE-MEETING QUESTIONS.	30

INTRODUCTION

Conservation today extends beyond traditional boundaries and paradigms, and to respond to new challenges facing parks and protected areas innovative ideas are needed. These new directions will also require new strategic leadership skills. International exchange can provide insights, new perspectives and new tools for the challenges ahead.

The idea of international cooperation is not new; it has a long and productive history, shaping the effectiveness of park and protected area management in countries around the world. One of the earliest examples of international exchange that had a profound impact on the evolution of conservation history was between Italy and the U.S. In the second half of 19th century, George Perkins Marsh wrote the conservation classic *Man and Nature* while serving as the first American Ambassador to Italy. His 1864 landmark book, translated into Italian and many other languages, was based on his observations of environmental change and his insights on landscape stewardship in the U.S., Italy and other European and Middle Eastern countries.

In this tradition of international exchange, the US National Park Service (hereinafter USNPS) has initiated a strategy to create new cooperative relationships and strengthen existing ones with European countries that are facing challenges similar to the ones faced by U.S. national parks and protected areas. In light of the terrible events of September 11th, it is now more important than ever to strengthen our commitment to international understanding and collaboration.

The USNPS and the Italian Servizio Conservazione della Natura initiated in June 2001 the meeting “New Directions in Parks and Protected Areas: Opportunities for U.S.-European Cooperation and Exchange” in order to start significant reflections on the following questions.

- How do we need to manage protected areas in order to balance local communities and conservation needs?
- What is to be considered a protected area in the 21st Century?
- How are the protected area's roles changing to face the challenges of the 21st Century?
- How do we sustain the long term vitality of protected areas?
- How can we cooperate internationally to face these challenges efficiently?

The participants, with their varied experiences and cultural values, were united by the same philosophy—the philosophy recently stated in *Rethinking the National Parks for the 21st*

Century: The National Park System Advisory Board Report 2001. “It is [our responsibility] to proclaim anew the meaning and value of parks, conservation, and recreation...The larger purpose of this mission is to build a citizenry that is committed to conserving its heritage and its home on earth.”

2

BACKGROUND FOR THE MEETING

In spring 2000, the USNPS and the Italian Servizio Conservazione della Natura (hereinafter ISCN) signed an Agreement for Cooperation in the Protection and Management of National Parks and Protected Areas (see Attachment I). The Director of the U.S. National Park Service asked Northeast Regional Director Marie Rust to be the lead representative on this international agreement with Italy, and asked her to work with the USNPS International Affairs Office and the USNPS Conservation Study Institute to develop a series of exchange programs with Italy and other countries in Europe. In the fall of 2000, a delegation from the USNPS attended an international conference and a series of meetings in Italy. During these discussions, the USNPS Northeast Region and the Conservation Study Institute agreed to host a meeting in June 2001 to further develop opportunities for international exchange that would benefit conservation in each participating country.

During 11-15 June 2001, the USNPS Northeast Region and the Conservation Study Institute in cooperation with QLF/Atlantic Center for the Environment, hosted two meetings focused on “New Directions in Parks and Protected Areas: Opportunities for US-European Cooperation and Exchange.” The international workshop convened on “The Future of the ISCN/USNPS Agreement,” was held on Monday, June 11th, and provided an opportunity for discussions between twenty four representatives from ISCN, several Italian national park presidents, and USNPS staff. The remainder of the week, 12-15 June was devoted to a working session, “Managing Cultural Landscapes and Dealing with Local Communities: New Strategies and Perspectives.” The working session placed special emphasis on exchange between the U.S. National Park Service and Italy, but also explored opportunities for cooperation with other countries of Europe, particularly Central Europe. Thirty two attendees shared their regional, national, and international perspectives from the East, West, North, South of the United States of America, from the South, Center, and North of Italy, as well as from the East and the West of Europe.

The preparation for both meetings was guided by a planning committee (see Attachment II) that made an extensive number of contacts with professionals, experts, universities, governmental organizations, and other scientific or international institutions in the field of

natural and cultural resources management in Italy, Europe, and the U.S. The attendees (see Attachment II) and several people who could not participate in the meeting responded to a list of pre-meeting questions focusing on the primary topics to be discussed (see Attachment III). These responses were made available to participants in advance of the meeting and were used to shape the agenda for the working session.

Given the goal of the meeting, the planning committee used structured dialogue in a lively format to synthesize many individual ideas into a common understanding. The meeting format allowed for many opportunities for participation and exchange among participants, while being highly structured to maximize the output from the group. Because this was an “idea generating meeting”, not a “decision making meeting”, a wide range of possibilities—rather than priorities—for international exchange were generated.

The beginning sessions of the meeting focused on exchange of knowledge through presentations by the participants. Over the course of the meeting, opportunities for presentation decreased, while those for reflection and dialogue increased. As the group shifted into discussion mode, small discussion groups mixed across nationalities and area of expertise. Subsequently, participants reorganized into more homogenous groups to focus on specific topics of common interest to each group.

Based on the pre-meeting questions, the planning committee synthesized and reflected back to the group what was said in the questionnaires. Four key conservation themes were recommended to the group; these are stewardship education, linking biodiversity and cultural diversity, balancing protection and sustainable development, co-management and partnerships. These themes are presented in Section 4 of this report. The group then identified possible joint projects within these themes.

GOALS AND MAIN RESULTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP

Monday, 11 June 2001

“THE FUTURE OF ISCN/USNP AGREEMENT”

The goals of this one-day workshop were (1) to exchange ideas, information and experience to improve the mutual knowledge of ISCN and USNPS; and (2) to further define topics and areas where international cooperation will improve the effectiveness of each of the two agencies.

NPS Northeast Regional Director Marie Rust welcomed participants on behalf of the USNPS Director and introduced representatives from USNPS parks and programs across the country. Through the discussions at the workshop, it was agreed that the following themes and areas offered rich potential for mutual organizational learning and enrichment:

1. Exploring strategies for development of positive, mutually beneficial relationships between local communities and neighboring national parks and protected areas.
Opportunities may include:
 - 1A. Cultivating an awareness of the role of parks in protecting the local “sense of identity” and finding ways to stimulate local community involvement including the promotion of the arts within parks.
 - 1B. Creating compatible and sustainable economic activities, such as branding of authentic local crafts and products associated with parks and protected areas as well as supporting "responsible tourism" in local communities.
2. Examining factors that can increase the efficiency and effectiveness of a parks and protected areas system. Opportunities may include techniques to improve volunteer management, self-financing mechanisms, and organizational development.

Monday afternoon (June 11th) was dedicated to concurrent workshops on different specific themes, selected through discussions with ISCN, including GIS, Inventory and Monitoring, Park Planning, and Volunteers Management. For example, during the section on Volunteer Management the participants in the workshop discussed a number of topics including the definition of “volunteer,” the cost of the USNPS Volunteer In Parks (VIP) program, the method for estimation of the value of Volunteer time, and the opportunities (including costs covered by the USNPS) for participants in the *International VIP Program* exchanges. The opportunity of sending groups of volunteers from the Lazio Region Park Agency to US National Parks under the *International VIP Program* was explored as well as

the opportunity to send single US volunteers through the *Park Professionals* program of the Association Nature and Art in Tuscany (NAT).

4

GOALS AND MAIN RESULTS OF THE WORKING SESSION

June 12-15, 2001

MANAGING CULTURAL LANDSCAPES AND DEALING WITH LOCAL COMMUNITIES: NEW STRATEGIES AND PERSPECTIVES

The goal of the working session was to exchange experience, find common areas of interest, and develop strategies for international cooperation and exchange. The focus was on new directions in conservation of parks, protected areas, corridors, and cultural landscapes benefiting conservation practice in all participating countries.

Related objectives include:

- Developing priority topics that can serve as a basis for mutual learning;
- Exploring options for exchanges and other joint activities to be undertaken in the coming three years; in particular, identifying institutions that might take the lead in selected project elements; and identifying potential sources of funding to support these activities.

A. KEY CONSERVATION THEMES:

The participants agreed on four themes that are fundamental to new directions in conservation:

1. Stewardship Education
2. Linking Biodiversity and Cultural Diversity
3. Balancing Protection and Sustainable Development
4. Co-Management and Partnerships

Working groups focused on each theme, developed a conceptual framework, and identified key components and questions useful for program development.

A1. Stewardship Education

Key Components

- Educating populations within and surrounding protected landscapes
- Clarifying the relevance of parks and protected lands to people's lives
- Sharing knowledge of parks and protected lands through public education
- Engaging youth in stewardship

Key Questions:

- a. How to uncover and promote the historical and cultural associations between people and protected areas?
- b. How to celebrate stewardship and local traditions?
- c. How to manage parks to stimulate people with different interests, ages and occupations to value parks as resources in their lives?
- d. How to successfully compete with the power of mass culture, cultural homogenization, and people's disconnection with their local heritage?
- e. How to model stewardship behavior in parks as an attribute of civil society and democracy?

A2. Linking Biodiversity and Cultural Diversity

Key Components

- Managing cultural landscapes
- Sustaining cultural diversity in protected landscapes
- Interpreting the ecological connections in cultural landscapes
- Incorporating research in management decisions; pro-actively conducting scientific and issues research

Key Questions

- a. How to identify and standardize environmental and cultural indicators and facilitate data sharing among different countries?
- b. How to conduct economic research on different agricultural price support policies in Europe and US?
- c. How to more effectively facilitate an exchange of experience from managing working landscapes in Europe and places with traditional landscape-based activities in the US?

A3. Balancing Protection and Sustainable Development

Key Components

- Balancing local and global benefits of protected areas
- Seeking equity in sharing benefits and costs of protected landscapes
- Understanding and articulating the economic benefits of protected lands
- Clarifying and balancing uses, particularly preservation, recreation and the dynamics of a living landscape

Key Questions

- a. How to identify and share best practices or benchmark realities?
- b. How to explore sustainable tourism frameworks, such as the European Charter for Sustainable Tourism, (1) as a catalyst for local action and participatory process, and (2) as a way to emphasize understanding and interpretation of local heritage?
- c. How to share methodologies for evaluating the economic feasibility of local initiatives and identifying ways to encourage and support start up phases of local sustainable and compatible business ventures?
- d. How to use natural and cultural heritage as an organizing theme for sustainable development?
- e. How to identify new sustainable economic models that can be piloted in protected areas?

A4. Co-Management and Partnerships

Key Components

- Linking the traditional top-down approach with a participatory approach in the planning process
- Building involvement and support of community members from areas within and surrounding protected landscapes
- Working with private land conservation
- Retaining identity and character of the place and seeking continuity of land use
- Working to reconcile conflicting needs, values, interests, and demands
- Integrating protected area planning into larger regional planning context
- Considering local projects within the landscape as a part of the whole and encouraging creative involvement of local players
- Including considerations of landscapes outside of protected boundaries
- Promoting craft stewardship partnerships and alliances with both like-minded and non-traditional stakeholders

- Supporting and encouraging sustainable, eco-, cultural and heritage tourism
- Moving the perspective and the approach from individual parks to networks.

Key Questions

- a. How to find areas where co-management and partnerships are working?
- b. How to create opportunities on both sides of the Atlantic to see actual models of collaboration, partnerships, and sustainable development?
- c. How to identify and share principles and guidelines for good practice and techniques and tools?
- d. How to share examples of global and regional initiatives (such as Local Agenda 21 and its local implementation programs, Parks for Life, etc.)?
- e. How to identify examples of private/philanthropic support for conservation?

NEXT STEPS - IDEAS FOR TRANS-ATLANTIC COLLABORATION

Based on the discussions of key conservation themes and current issues, the final two days of the working session were devoted to developing specific ideas for Trans-Atlantic collaboration. These ideas are described below. Please note that the names included as contacts in the following section are the people who developed the concept at the working session and thus represents the beginning of a network with common interests. It is important to note that the list of contacts is not meant to imply a firm commitment by these individuals or their organizations to specific actions. More detailed planning will be needed to advance these ideas into programs, and it is the hope of the participants that this report will serve as a catalyst for this collaborative work.

A. PROPOSED PROGRAM UNDER ISCN-USNPS AGREEMENT

A1. ISCN-USNPS Agreement

1. *Concept*: Continue professional exchange between national parks in Italy and the US for mutual understanding and organizational improvement.
2. *Goals/outcomes*: Enhance professional development through exchanging knowledge and experience on various aspects of national park management
3. *Audience*: National parks and protected areas in Italy and US
4. *Partners/Who will be involved*: ISCN and USNPS, and partners
5. *Activities including those already planned*:

The following **4 actions** have been planned:

1st Action: *Workshop on parks and local authentic products*

- Schedule: Spring 2002

Workshop on parks and local authentic products

- Duration: 5 days, including visits
- Objective: Examine strategies aimed at using the identity of parks and protected areas to market products that will support sustainable and compatible local economic activities, supporting traditional culture, and capitalizing on association with products to spread a stewardship message.
- Scope: Share best practices in strategies to brand or market products and best practices in production strategies including both handcraft and agricultural products.

- Possible specific topics: quality park logo; ecotourism; education and training activities for local communities – awareness; role of organizations aimed at promoting the products outside of the Parks (such as Cooperating organizations)
- Method: problem solving approach – best practices and benchmark realities comparison
- Location: Italian Park (to be determined) and site visits to other case studies from central location

2nd Action *Seminar on legal instruments related to local communities*

- Schedule: Fall 02
- Objective: Discuss balancing local communities' needs with nature conservation mission through legal instruments
- Duration: 1 day
- Scope: national systemic legislation. Italian Park Frame Law, National Park Service Organic Act

3rd Action: *Meeting on Parks agricultural production and cultural gastronomy*

- Possible period: October 2002, related to the *Slow Food* planned events
- Location: Italy
- Attendees: US NPS/NER Regional Director, USNPS staff and partners

4th Action: *Training course for Park Managers and Officials*

- Schedule: To be determined
- Training course focus: volunteers involvement, self-financing activities, performance indicators
- Localization: USA – US National Park (to be determined)
- Approach: Training sessions, using case studies, and site visits.
- Attendees: international colleagues from the US and Europe, including ISCN and USNPS

6. *Funding*: Apply to EU to fund training

7. *Schedule*: (see #5 above)

8. *Contacts*: Marie Rust, Patrizia De Angelis, Paola Anitori, Gay Vietzke, Federico Niccolini, Barbara Pollarine, John Debo, Rolf Diamant, Nora Mitchell

B. COOPERATION WITH EUROPARC

B1. Develop a Partnership Program for Exchange (based on the Europarc Model)

1. *Concept*: Establish a Partnership Program for Exchange on specific management issues
2. *Goals/outcomes*: Transatlantic cooperation on research and exchange of ideas on challenging management issues
3. *Audience*: protected area managers in US/Italy/Europe
4. *Partners/Who will be involved*: Europarc and USNPS
5. *Activities including those already planned*: develop criteria for entering into a partnership program; sponsor pilot partnership programs
6. *Funding*: (to be determined)
7. *Schedule*: (to be determined)
8. *Contacts*: John Debo and Patrizia Rossi

B2. Europarc USNPS/NER Cooperation (proposed Agreement)

1. *Concept*: Share training opportunities and increase connections through Europarc/USNPS cooperation
2. *Goals/outcomes*: Increase professionalism and improve skills to protect and promote protected areas
3. *Audience*: Park and program managers
4. *Partners/Who will be involved*: USNPS/NER and Europarc
5. *Activities including those already planned*: Agreement, web-based information sharing, profiles of parks through Europarc formula
6. *Funding*: Existing funds, participatory organizations, NGOs
7. *Schedule*: Agreement signed October 2001 at Europarc Conference
8. *Contacts*: Edie Shean-Hammond and Patrizia Rossi

C. CONSERVATION LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

C1. New Leadership Skills for a New Era of Conservation

1. *Concept*: Joint international professional leadership development with National Park and Protected Area staff in both the theory and practice of a “new” conservation paradigm
2. *Goals/outcomes*: Increase understanding of conceptual and practical application in policy makers and landscape management, to enhance protected area management and cooperation with local communities; also expose next generation of leaders to a new paradigm in conservation
3. *Audience*: Park and Protected Area staff in US, Italy, and other European countries at the middle to senior management level, decision-makers
4. *Partners/Who will be involved*: International Centre for Protected Landscapes (hereinafter ICPL), ICCROM, ICMCL, USNPS/CSI, Europarc, QLF Atlantic Center, and other partners
5. *Activities including those already planned*: Two short courses, one in US and one in Italy (Pangea Institute or ICMCL in Cilento), based on case study visits. Link this initiative to the ICCROM workshop on cultural landscapes planned for fall 2002 in Rome.
6. *Funding*: EU, Recipient organizations
7. *Schedule*: Coordinate with ICCROM workshop in fall 2002
8. *Contacts*: Liz Hughes, Nora Mitchell, Jessica Brown, Katri Lisitzin

C2. Leadership Development – Bi-Lateral Study Tours

1. *Concept*: Annual or Bi-annual Study Tour of US and Italy sites to exchange experiences on cultural landscapes, education, biodiversity and cultural diversity
2. *Goals/outcomes*: (1) evaluate examples, (2) build long-term professional relationships
3. *Audience*: competitive selection of young and mid-career professional staff and potential senior leaders from USNPS/INCS/Partners/Europarc. The target number of participants is 20-30 people while the optimal composition is half US and half Italian with 10-15 years left in their career
4. *Partners/Who will be involved*: USNPS/INCS/Partners/Europarc
5. *Activities, including those already planned*: Structured study tour, meetings and presentations by park, cultural landscape, and other professionals
6. *Funding*: USNPS/INCS/Partners/Europarc and foundations
7. *Schedule*: 2 weeks in the US, 2 weeks in Italy - Europe
8. *Contacts*: Larry Belli

D. LANDSCAPE CONSERVATION EXCHANGES

D1. International Symposium on Trans-boundary Heritage Areas/Corridors

1. *Concept*: Convene an international group to bring attention and new ideas to Trans-boundary Heritage Areas/Corridors management and development, based in the proposed Champlain-Richelieu Heritage Corridor (US-Canadian)
2. *Goals/outcomes*: Create a venue for exchange of international experience with Protected Landscapes (similar to Heritage Areas in the US); bring together diverse stakeholders in the area through this international meeting; provide ideas on trans-boundary cooperation
3. *Audience*: European and US colleagues who manage or work with large scale protected landscapes and transboundary issues; and local stakeholders and key institutions (USNPS, Parks Canada, state and provincial agencies, NGOs, etc.)
4. *Partners/Who will be involved*: QLF/Atlantic Center for the Environment, USNPS, Conservation Study Institute, City of Burlington, and other partners
5. *Activities, including those already planned*: international conference in spring/summer 2002
6. *Funding*: Some funding is already in place from US, Canada, Province of Quebec; additional funds will be needed
7. *Schedule*: conference to be held in the spring/summer 2002
8. *Contacts*: Anne Drost, QLF/Atlantic Center (adrost@qlf.org), Jessica Brown, Nora Mitchell

D2. Greenways Exchange

Balancing protection and sustainable development using team problem solving

1. *Concept*: International Greenways Exchange
Model (socio-economic and environmental) ecosystem management approach
 - economic implications of heritage designation (publication)
 - compare methods, case studies
 - bring people together – study tour
 - partnerships

Proposed name and logo: “ONIONS: International Greenways”

2. *Goals/outcomes*: Exchange on International Greenways

Create a forum/network to share tools for conservation

Create an international association to facilitate, meet, and organize cooperation

Bi-lateral exchange of field level practitioners

Topic – Battlefield Protection Program example

A bottom-up movement

Provide continental context to help local efforts

Connect: EU, EG Association, and US Greenways (will need to form a group)

3. *Audience*: Greenways in US and Europe such as Carpathian “Via Alpina” Connecting the parks along the Alps, Appennino Parco Europa - “APE” European Greenways, Prague-Vienna-Budapest Greenway

4. *Partners/Who will be involved*: Amber Trail Greenway, Dave Sampson, Paul Labovitz, APE, Legambiente, QLF

5. *Activities, including those already planned*:

9/01 Rails-to-Trails International Trails and Greenways Conference

Convene meeting with EGA (Organizer: David Sampson and Paul Labovitz)

9/01 Study Tour for C. Europeans of US Greenways

Formation of International Greenways Association and schedule initial meeting associated with the next EGA meeting

6. *Funding*: EPCE (@STL), EU Funds, QLF, NPS, Foundations, GMP Corporate (Kodak, Amex)

7. *Schedule*: (see #5 above)

8. *Contacts*: David Sampson, Paul Labovitz, Mirek Kundrata, Massimo Sargolini, Paolo Perna, Patrizia Rossi, Romina Cavatassi

D3. Study Program for Community Integration in Protected Area Management

1. *Concept*: Establish a study program for NPS and Heritage Area staff concentrating on community integration with Protected Area management

2. *Goals/outcomes*: stimulate more inclusive thinking, resulting in more inclusive management; encourage longer-term perspectives on stewardship; stimulate “global thinking” perspective in decision-making processes

3. *Audience*: US parks and protected areas and local communities and international counterparts

4. *Partners*: Heritage Areas/Alliance; NPS; state parks; multi-agency; local governments and Italian/European counterparts
5. *Activities including those already planned*: to be defined
6. *Funding*: Heritage Area Alliance; Sonoran Institute, NPS, Local Governments, other foundation funding
7. *Schedule*: 2002 – ad infinitum
8. *Contacts*: Laura Soulliere and Art Eck

D4. Presentations at George Wright Society (GWS) Conference, San Diego, April 14-18, 2003 (www.georgewright.org)

1. *Concept*: Summarize the path and the results of programs originated by the 2001 working session
2. *Goals/outcomes*: Summary papers, information dissemination
3. *Audience*: international, GWS, US and Italy, other governments and NGOs
4. *Partners/Who will be involved*: participants to the working session, and GWS
5. *Activities including those already planned*: Presentations and posters at the conference in 2003
6. *Funding*: various sources – explore opportunities for international fellowships. ICS and GWS could be asked for assistance in finding support
7. *Schedule*: 2003, then 2005, then 2007
8. *Contacts*: Laura Soulliere, Nora Mitchell

E. RESEARCH ON NEW DIRECTIONS IN CONSERVATION

E1. Participatory Research on Best Practices for Collaborative Approaches to Landscape Conservation

1. *Concept*: Identify principles, methods, tools of partnerships and co-management through gathering case studies of best practices in Europe and the US. Through analysis of case studies of collaborative approaches from both sides of the Atlantic, identify trends, models, and principles. Make strategic comparisons to show similarities and best practices and identify gaps. Focus on both Protected Areas and the wider landscape. This is a Trans-Atlantic continuation of the Stewardship Initiative (1998-2000) conducted by QLF/Atlantic Center and Conservation Study Institute; this would be Phase 2 (2001-2005)

2. *Goals/outcomes*: Improve park, Protected Area, and landscape management more broadly. Specific outcomes include: (1) network building, (2) publication and website linked to other web sites, (3) guide planning for future exchanges, (4) include in IUCN's World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) Guideline series ("Cardiff Series")
3. *Audience*: Protected Area managers and partners, NGOs, people involved in landscape conservation in both US and Europe
4. *Partners/Who will be involved*: QLF/Atlantic Center for the Environment, Conservation Study Institute, International Centre for Protected Landscapes (ICPL), ICCROM, Europarc, ECO-ECO, EPC
5. *Activities including those already planned*: Sequential study tours – collaborative small teams would visit places and develop profiles of projects showing good practice
6. *Funding*: Foundations, EU, UNEP
7. *Schedule*: still to be exactly defined
8. *Contacts*: Jessica Brown, Nora Mitchell, Mirek Kandrata, Liz Hughes, Brenda Barrett, Lucilla Previati, Romina Cavatassi, Massimo Sargolini, Patrizia Rossi

E2. Research on Costs and Benefits of Protected Area Designation

1. *Concept*: Conduct integrated evaluation of costs and benefits from Protected Area designation phase to project intervention (including public expenditure) and compare within and across countries (US and Europe)
2. *Goals/outcomes*: To improve awareness of the values of Protected Areas, to measure economic impact and social capital, to enhance positive effects on local communities, to encourage more effective conservation
3. *Audience*: politicians, local administrators, stakeholders, land owners, Protected Area managers and partners, funders, agencies that have the power to modify the landscape
4. *Partners/Who will be involved*: Universities in Italy, other European countries and the US through an integrated, cross discipline, multidisciplinary approach, foundations, park and Protected Area management agencies, Denver Service Center (USNPS)
5. *Activities including those already planned*: to be exactly identified
6. *Funding*: to be exactly identified
7. *Schedule*: to be exactly defined
8. *Contacts*: Romina Cavatassi, Art Eck, Brenda Barrett, Roberto Gambino

E3. Research on Environmental Valuation

1. *Concept*: Identify and collate models of environmental valuation (social, cultural, biological) using case studies in Europe and the US. Conduct integrated evaluation of costs and benefits from Protected Area
2. *Goals/outcomes*: Menu of tools for park and Protected Area managers
3. *Audience*: *to be identified*
4. *Partners/Who will be involved*: *to be identified*
5. *Activities including those already planned*: *to be identified*
6. *Funding*: Funding strategy through an International Partnership of Foundations, Fondazione Enrico Mattei, ERVET, Universities, ECO & ECO (Nomisma Prodi), Getty Conservation Institute, Pew Charitable Trust, Rockefeller, World Bank
7. *Schedule*: *to be identified*
8. *Contacts*: Romina Cavatassi, Art Eck, Brenda Barrett, Roberto Gambino

This activity may be combined with the other research concept, in E2 above

F. STEWARDSHIP EDUCATION

F1. Establish a Joint US-Italy Training Program on Environmental Education

1. *Concept*: Establish a joint US-Italy training program on environmental education
2. *Goals/outcomes*: *to be exactly defined*
3. *Audience*: US parks and protected areas and local communities; Italian parks staff and local communities
4. *Partners/Who will be involved*: Italian National Consortium for Environmental Education and USNPS training centers and Italian Federation of Parks and Protected Areas
5. *Activities including those already planned*:
6. *Funding*: EU Programs, National funds and parks funds
7. *Schedule*: *to be defined*
8. *Contacts*: Maurilio Cipparone, John Debo, Rolf Diamant, and Nora Mitchell

F2. Develop Common Methods for Interpretive Planning

1. *Concept*: Develop common strategies for interpretive planning, starting from the possible US participation in the first Italian National Convention of Park Interpreters
2. *Goals/outcomes*: Improve the quality of interpretive services in Protected areas, and help to spread and develop the discipline
3. *Audience*: to be exactly identified
4. *Partners/Who will be involved*: Italian NGO, InterpEurope, National Association of Interpreters (NAI) - US
5. *Activities including those already planned*: Italian National Convention of Park Interpreters, US Participation and presentation of current experience, Autumn 2001
6. *Funding*: Italian sponsors
7. *Schedule*: Autumn 2001
8. *Contacts*: Maurilio Cipparone, Rolf Diamant, and Nora Mitchell

G. EXCHANGE ON CURRENT CONSERVATION ISSUES

G1. International Conference on Regeneration of Rural Communities Through Protected Areas/Landscapes

1. *Concept*: identify strategies to promote protected Landscapes as Models of Sustainable Use, moving from an International Conference to be organized in Italy (or in another Mediterranean country)
2. *Goals/outcomes*: Presentation of ways and models of sustainable land use practices to regenerate rural areas; proceedings manual
3. *Audience*: Transatlantic Protected Area managers, NGOs, governments (regional), politicians, and planning and economic experts
4. *Partners/Organizers*: Italian government, WCPA Europe “Parks for Life”, ICPL could be investigated as potentially interested
5. *Activities, including those already planned*: IUCN/WCPA Contacts
6. *Funding*: Some Mediterranean Governments, EU could be investigated as potential source of funding
7. *Schedule*: 2 years planning (countries to develop models)
8. *Contacts*: Andrej Sovinc, Lucilla Previati, Jessica Brown

G2. Workshop on Methods and Strategies for the Reduction of the Impacts of Traffic in Protected Areas

1. *Concept*: Explore experience on different traffic/transportation options in parks from both sides of the Atlantic
2. *Goals/outcomes*: Compile best practice examples
3. *Audience*: Protected Area managers, decision-makers, planners
4. *Partners/Who will be involved*: One European PA and One American PA
5. *Activities, including those already planned*: IUCN/WCPA Network
6. *Funding*: EU Funds, RSPB, TEA21 (USA) could be investigated as potential source of funding
7. *Schedule*: *still to be exactly defined*
8. *Contacts*: Andrej Sovinc

G3. The Conservation Use of Military Areas

1. *Concept*: With the demilitarization, especially after fall of the Iron Curtain, many of the previous military area are now abandoned, and many have conservation value for landscape and natural resources, particularly of many endangered or threatened species
2. *Goals/outcomes*: Provide guidelines for management of such areas for biodiversity and landscape conservation
3. *Audience*: military authorities, experts, scientists, NGOs, Protected Area managers from both sides of the Atlantic
4. *Partners/Who will be involved*: the project could be developed under the coordination of IUCN/WCPA – Parks for Life
5. *Activities including those already planned*: WCPA Expert Network
6. *Funding*: NATO
7. *Schedule*: *still to be exactly defined*
8. *Contacts*: Lucilla Previati and Andrej Sovinc

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS AND STARTING POINT FOR FUTURE WORK

Several important goals were achieved at “New Directions in Parks and Protected Areas,” and particularly at the working session “Managing Cultural Landscapes and Dealing with Local Communities.” First, the participants generated several ideas and options for cooperation described in this report. Second, many important topics related to the long term aspects of protected areas management were discussed from a scientific perspective.

In particular, all participants agreed to bear in mind the following general considerations for future cooperative work:

- it is very difficult to decide whether a piece of land can be considered as a "cultural landscape" while another is to be excluded, since each landscape owns and is an expression of a cultural meaning (R. GAMBINO);
- it is necessary to consider that the protected area's concept and classifications need to be modified according to the recent direction from IUCN (A. SOVINC);
- a managerial approach to protected areas is becoming an increasingly important need. A systemic vision, in which each protected area is an irreplaceable part of a system—just as every piece is necessary to complete a puzzle—needs to be linked to a functional vision, in which each protected area is considered part of a larger system which cannot fully function if each component piece is not efficiently functioning—just as an engine stops if one of its pieces is not functioning) (F. NICCOLINI);
- globalization trends are affecting protected areas management and their very existence. Each effort, investment, strategy, or project may be soon destroyed by global trends such as ozone reduction, global warming, and social and economical trends (M. CIPPARONE).

But most of all, participants agreed on the importance of a continued commitment to protected areas conservation and education, pointing out the high value of international cooperation to understand our mission in the future and to identify solutions to face problems which could not be solved through isolated approaches.

ATTACHMENT I

**UNDERSTANDING
BETWEEN
THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
AND
THE NATURE CONSERVATION SERVICE
OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT
OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY
ON
COOPERATION IN THE PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT
OF NATIONAL PARKS AND OTHER CATEGORIES OF PROTECTED AREAS**

The National Park Service of the Department of the Interior of the United States of America and the Nature Conservation Service of the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Italy, hereinafter referred to as “the Participants;”

RECOGNIZING the mutual interest between the Participants in identifying natural and cultural heritage sites of international, national, and regional significance; establishing and managing national parks, protected areas, and historical and archeological sites; and supporting related public awareness and involvement programs; and,

ACKNOWLEDGING the importance of tourism development in enhancing local, regional, and national economies and recognizing the necessity to manage and protect their natural and cultural resources while providing for the education and enjoyment for parks’ and protected areas’ visitors;

Have reached the following understandings:

Article I

The Participants may study the possibilities for the realization, promotion, and support of activities concerning conservation and sustainable development of natural resources, within the protection of their respective natural and cultural heritage.

Article II

The Participants, interested in the identification and conservation of natural and cultural heritage sites that are internationally, nationally and regionally important, may support a joint work program in order to define several activities of mutual interest and benefit in the following areas:

- exchange of information, scientific data, and experiences about parks;
- experiments for natural protection inside parks;
- defining methodologies for national parks management and monitoring programs;
- evaluation of innovative strategies for management of new national parks;
- preparation and use of geographical information systems;
- promotion of environmental education programs; and
- promotion of sustainable tourism inside parks.

Article III

The Participants may identify and decide on activities subject to the availability of funds.

Article IV

ACTIVITIES UNDER THIS UNDERSTANDING COMMENCE UPON SIGNATURE FOR FIVE YEARS AND MAY BE EXTENDED FOR FURTHER FIVE-YEAR PERIODS. EITHER PARTICIPANT, UPON SIX MONTHS WRITTEN NOTIFICATION TO THE OTHER PARTICIPANT, MAY TERMINATE THIS UNDERSTANDING AT ANY TIME.

Done in Rome on this 14 day of April 2000, in duplicate, in English and Italian, both texts being equally valid.

**THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**THE NATURE
CONSERVATION SERVICE
OF THE MINISTRY OF
ENVIRONMENT OF THE
REPUBLIC OF ITALY**

ATTACHMENT II PARTICIPANTS LIST

* Planning Committee Member

Dr. Paola Anitori
Official, Italian Ministry of Environment
Servizio Conservazione della Natura
Via Capitan Bavastro, 174
00154 Rome
ITALY
Phone: 39 06 57228222

Brenda Barrett
National Coordinator for Heritage Areas
Heritage Areas Program
USNPS
1849 C St. NW, Room 3128
Washington, DC 20240
USA
Phone: 202-565-1179
Fax: 202-273-1133
Email: brenda_barrett@nps.gov

Larry Belli
USNPS Outer Banks Group
1401 National Park Dr.
Manteo, NC 27954
USA
Phone: 252-473-2111 x148
Fax: 252-473-2595
Email: larry_belli@nps.gov

Dr. Walter Bonan
President
Parco Nazionale Dolomiti Bellunesi
Piazzale Zancaro, 1
32032 Feltre, BL
ITALY
Phone: 39-0439-3328
Fax: 39-0439-332999
Email: presidente@dolomitipark.it

Dr. Franco Bonini
President
Parco Nazionale Cinque Terre
Via Signorini, 118
19017 Riomaggiore, SP
ITALY
Phone: 0187/760000 –
0187/920193
Fax: 0187/920866
Email: pres.parco5terre@libero.it

Paul Bray
90 South Swan St., Suite 106
Albany, NY 12210
USA
Phone: 518-449-2551
Fax: 518-465-6557
Email: PMBRAY@aol.com

* Jessica Brown
Vice President, International Programs
QLF/Atlantic Center for the Environment
55 South Main St.
Ipswich, MA 01938
USA
Phone: 978-356-0038
Fax: 978-356-7322
Email: jbrown@qlf.org

Romina Cavatassi
Consultant
FAO
Via Cavatassi 32
64018 Tortoreto, TE
ITALY
Phone: 39-3473227988 39-861787149
Fax: 39-861-788487
Email: cavaromy@hotmail.com OR
romina.cavatassi@fao.org

Prof. Maurilio Cipparone
President
Regione Lazio Regional Park Agency
Via Indonesia 33
00144 Rome
ITALY
Phone: 39-065913371
Fax: 39-065919404
Email: presidente.arp@parchilazio.it

* Delia Clark (Meeting Facilitator)
Program Director
Antioch New England Institute/
Antioch New England Graduate School
PO Box 97
Taftsville, VT 05073
USA
Phone: 802-457-2075
Fax: 802-457-2114
Email: dclark@antiochne.edu

Dr. Patrizia De Angelis
Vice Direttore
Ministry of the Environment
Servizio Conservazione della Natura
Via Capitan Bavastro, 174
00154 Rome
ITALY
Phone: 39-06-57228510
Fax: 39-06-57228390
Email: scn-div4-dir@minambiente.it

John Debo
Superintendent
Cuyahoga Valley National Park
15610 Vaughn Rd.
Brecksville, OH 44141-3018
USA
Phone: 440-546-5903
Fax: 440-546-5905
Email: john_debo@nps.gov

Rolf Diamant
Superintendent
Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller
National Historical Park
PO Box 178
Woodstock, VT 05091
USA
Phone: 802-457-3368 x15
Fax: 802-457-3405
Email: rolf_diamant@nps.gov

Art Eck
Deputy Regional Director
USNPS Pacific West Region
1111 Jackson St., Suite 700
Jackson Center One
Oakland, CA 94607
USA
Phone: 805-370-2341
Fax: 805-370-1850
Email: art_eck@nps.gov

Prof. Roberto Gambino
Politecnico di Torino
Dipartimento Interateneo del Territorio
Viale Mattioli 39
10125 Torino
ITALY
Phone: 39-011-564756 or 484
Fax: 39-011-5647499
Email: gambino@archi.polito.it

Dr. Liz Hughes
Executive Director
International Centre for Protected
Landscapes
8E, Science Park
SY23 3AH Aberystwyth, Wales
UNITED KINGDOM
Phone: 44 1970 622 620/1
Fax: 44 1970 622 619
Email: ejh@aber.ac.uk

Mirek Kundrata
Director
Environmental Partnership for Central
Europe-Czech Republic
Nadace Partnerství
Panská 7
602 00 Brno 1
CZECH REPUBLIC
Phone: 4205 4221 8350
Fax: 4205 4222 1744
Email: miroslav.kundrata@ecn.cz OR
pship@ecn.cz

Paul Labovitz
Project Leader
Rivers and Trails Program
NPS Midwest Region
2179 Everett Rd
Peninsula, OH 44264
USA

Phone: 330-657-2950
Fax: 330-657-2955
Email: paul_labovitz@nps.gov

Avv. Costanza Lega
Expert
Italian Ministry of Environment
Servizio Conservazione della Natura
Via Capitano Bavastro, 174
00154 Rome
ITALY
Phone: 39 6 8865893
Email:

* Nora Mitchell
Director
USNPS Conservation Study Institute
PO Box 178
Woodstock, VT 05091
USA
Phone: 802-457-3368 x17
Fax: 802-457-3405
Email: nora_mitchell@nps.gov

* Dr. Federico Niccolini
Park Managerial Consultant
Park Management Consulting
Piazza Guerazzi, 9
56125 Pisa
ITALY
Phone: 39-050-505020 or 11
Fax: 39-050-505050
Email: fniccolini@parkmanagement.it

Dr. Antonio Perna
President
Parco Nazionale dell'Aspromonte
P.za G. Mangeruca Gambiarie di Santo
Stefano in Aspromonte
89050 RC
ITALY
Phone: 39/0965-743060
Fax: 39-0965-743026

Dr. Paolo Perna
Park Expert
Helix S.r.l
Abbadia di Fiastra 2
62010 Urbisaglia, MC
ITALY
Phone: 0733 201257
Fax: 0733 204001
Email:

* Barbara Pollarine
Park Planner
Valley Forge National Historical Park
PO Box 953
Valley Forge, PA 19482
USA
Phone: 610/783-1032
Fax: 610-783-1088
Email: barbara_pollarine@nps.gov

Ms. Lucilla Previati
Superintendent, Consorzio Parco Regionale
Del Delta Del Po
Via Cavour, 11
44022 Comacchio, FE
ITALY
Phone: 39-0533-314003
Fax: 39-0533-318007
Email: lucprev@tin.it

Ing. Pasquale Ricciardi
Manager (retired)
Italian Ministry of Environment
Servizio Conservazione della Natura
Via Capitan Bavastro, 174
00154 Rome
ITALY

Dr. Bernadino Romano
Park Expert, Monteluco di Rolo
P.le Pontieri 1
67100 L'Aquila
ITALY
Phone: 39-0862-434113
Fax: 39-0862-434143
Email: romano@dau.ing.univaq.it

Ms. Patrizia Rossi
Superintendent
Parco Naturale Regionale Alpi Marittime
Corso Dante Livio Bianco, 5
12010 Valdieri, Cuneo
ITALY
Phone: 39-0171 97397
Fax: 39-0171 97542
Email: parcalma.rossi@tin.it

Ms. Marie Rust
Northeast Regional Director
USNPS Northeast Region
200 Chestnut St.
Philadelphia, PA 19106
USA
Phone: 215-597-7013
Fax: 215-597-0815
Email: marie_rust@nps.gov

David Sampson
34 E. Road
Troy, NY 12180
USA
Phone: 518-272-6565
Fax: 518-272-5573
Email: dvsampson@aol.com

Prof. Massimo Sargolini
Park Planner
Studio Sargolini Associati
Contrada Palura n 370
62028 Samano, MC
ITALY
Phone: 39-0733-658532
Fax: 39-0733-658488
Email: maxarg@tiscalinet.it

Laura Soulliere
Superintendent
Cane River Creole National Historical Park
400 Rapides Dr.
Natchitoches, LA 71457
USA
Phone: 318-352-0383
Fax: 318-352-4549
Email: laura_souilliere@nps.gov

Andrej Sovinc
European Coordinator
IUCN "Parks for Life"
Hajdrihova 28c
1000 Ljubljana
SLOVENIJA
Phone: 386-1 42 56 458
Fax: 386 1 42 64 162
Email: andrej.sovinc@guest.arnes.si

Mrs. Benedetta Trapazzo
Official
Italian Ministry of Environment
Servizio Conservazione della Natura
Via Capitan Bavastro, 174
00154 Rome
ITALY
Phone: 39-06-57228004
Fax: 39-06-57228577
Email: bettatrapazzo@hotmail.com

* Gay Vietzke
Management Assistant to the Northeast
Regional Director
USNPS Northeast Region
200 Chestnut St.
Philadelphia, PA 19106
USA
Phone: 215/597-7062
Fax: 215/597-0815
Email: gay_vietzke@nps.gov

PEOPLE INVITED BY UNABLE TO ATTEND

Dr. Aldo Cosentino
Director
Servizio Conservazione della Natura
Ministry of the Environment
Via Capitan Bavastro, 174
00154 Rome
ITALY
Phone: 06-57228509-15
Fax: 06-57228577
Email:

Katri Lisitzin
Swedish University of Agricultural
Sciences
Dept. of Landscape Planning Ultuna
PO Box 7012
SE-750 07 Uppsala,
SWEDEN
Phone: 46 18 67 10 00
Fax: 46 18 67 35 12
Email: kl@iccrom.org

Ing. Stefano Mastrelli
President
Migliarino-San Rossore-Massaciuccoli
Regional Park
Via Aurelia Nord, 4
56100 Pisa
ITALY
Phone: 39 050 525500
Fax: 39 050 533650
Email: maestre@supereva.it

Kenton Miller
Chair, IUCN World Commission on
Protected Areas
VP, International Development and
Conservation
World Resources Institute
10 G St. NE, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20002
USA
Phone: 202-729-7785
Fax: 202-729-7775
Email: kenton@wri.org

On. Arturo Osio
President
Parco Nazionale dello Stelvio
Via Roma, 26
23032 Bormio, SO
ITALY
Phone: 0342/910100
Fax: 0342/919063
Email: info@stelviopark.it

Andrew W. Reynolds
Deputy Advisor
Office of the Science and Technology
Advisor to the Secretary of State
US State Department
2201 C St. NW, Room 3240
Washington, DC 20520
USA
Phone: 202 647-8725
Fax: 202 647-5136
Email: a.reynolds@state.gov

Prof. Andrea Simoncini
Park Juridical Consultant
ParkManagenent Consulting
Piazza Guerazzi, 9
56125 Pisa
ITALY
Phone: 39-050-505020 or 11
Fax: 39-050-505050
Email: asimoncini@parkmanagement.it

Herb Stovel
Programme Director
Heritage Settlements Programme
ICCROM
Via di San Michele, 13
00153 Rome
ITALY
Phone: 39 06 558553316
Fax: 39 06 58553349
Email: hs@iccrom.org

Dominika Zareba
Program Manager
Environmental Partnership for Central
Europe-Poland
Dundacja Partnerstwo dla Srodowiska
Ul. Bracka 6/6
31-005 Krokow
POLAND
Phone: 48 12 4225088
Fax: 48 12 4294725
Email: zareba@epce.org.pl

ATTACHMENT III

RESPONSES TO THE PRE-MEETING QUESTIONS

What do you see in your country as the key issues and challenges facing parks, protected areas in managing cultural landscapes and in dealing with local communities?

Italian Servizio Conservazione della Natura Delegation: Italian landscape represents the product of the integration of different values in the fields of biodiversity, nature and culture. If we talk about sustainable development we should optimize mainly cultural diversity, including artistic heritage and traditional working such as handicraft, cattle-breeding techniques and typical foods products.

I think one of the key issues for protected areas and parks is related to sustainable tourism. Our Minister in this perspective is working on the promotion of program agreements aiming the development of economic actions realized with other Minister, Regions involving private and public subjects. Others initiatives related with the above programs are connected with the problems of the historical centre restoration.

Brenda Barrett: In the United States many significant cultural landscapes are located outside of the National Park system or extend beyond national Park boundaries. While some are located in nationally designated heritage areas, trails or river corridors, those areas are only protected to the extent that the local communities institute management plans and local land use controls. The conservation results are thus very variable. For significant landscapes that are not designated, there is not even that limited degree of protection. Some of the key issues and challenges are:

- How much initiative should the Federal government take to identify, designate, and assist in the protection of non-park cultural landscapes?
- What if these landscapes are adjacent to a National Park unit and contribute to the significance of the park's story?
- What is the appropriate role for state and local governments? Should the Federal government foster programs to encourage their participation in landscape preservation?
- How can traditional working landscapes maintain economic viability with increased government management?

Paul Bray: A keep challenge is to have traditional park authorities like the National Park Service and state park agencies understand that the idea of park now encompasses cultural landscapes whether they are greenways like the Hudson River Valley Greenway or heritage areas and these new parks are pluralistic, partnership parks for which local communities should be active participants in planning and management.

Romina Cavatassi: I think one of the key issues for protected areas and parks is related to biodiversity conservation and also to carbon sequestration. A protected area or/and a park, indeed, contribute to the enhancement of those global benefits, which are, nowadays, key issues (especially in the light of the Kyoto protocol).

Probably carbon sequestration benefits are by product of protected areas and parks but still benefits to take into account in selecting and strengthening protected areas. However, explicit biodiversity conservation objectives need to be established for each protected area and in particular they need to be better integrated into the framework of social, environmental and economic welfare. Obviously this integration require to overcome serious obstacles such as:

- Conflicts with local people: they will have restricted use of the resources and conflicts with tourists, loggers, miners, fishermen or hunters may erupt. In some cases local people have very strong tradition, which are in some way perturbed. How should this be managed? The society at large reaps the global benefits while local people bear the cost. Should they be compensated for that?

- Many protected areas are inefficiently managed: most managers need training especially in order to meet the needs and requirement of those who use the areas to mitigate the environmental impacts and the impact to local people.
- Funding: Funds for protected areas are usually inadequate or insecure. Much come from national budget are subject to be cut in favor of other politics or projects or owing to government change.
- Education: Many people see protected areas and the importance of environment in a very narrow way. Protected areas contribute to society at large in many different ways and the environment must be considered not just as the natural environment but also in terms of society, traditions, cultural landscape and so on. Education is required in order the parks being effectively managed and the people being more involved.

Maurilio Cipparone: The main key issues, or challenges, from my point of view, might be represented by the need to change the vision of the Protected Area seen as something “separate” from the rest of the territory. Also the culture (knowledge, skills, advocacy etc...) related to the Pas’ issue, is seen as a special culture, owned only by few “specialist” or by very motivated and dedicated people.

In other words, any management of any protected area (not only the management of the cultural landscapes) must take in account the attitude of the “people” and in many countries (not to speak about Italy!) Protected Areas and people are still too far from each other.

The main challenge for the success of any strategy concerning Pas is strictly linked to the capacity, of the Parks, to promote consensus, to create alliances, to build up partnership and stewardship.

Rolf Diamant:

- Developing collaborative relationships with NGOs, public agencies, communities and the private sector based on mutual respect, common interests and a broader strategic vision for enhancing regional sustainability. This will involve moving to the next level of partnerships that focus on issues both inside and outside parks and protected areas.
- Breaking down the entrenched dichotomy of natural and cultural management and the traditional influence of academic and bureaucratic specialization and protectionism.
- Developing new entrepreneurial economic models and partnerships for sustainable tourism, local enterprise and agriculture strengthening the stability and health of traditional land uses and local communities.

Arthur Eck:

- Insufficient resources, in terms of funding and personnel, to properly conserve park resources.
- Lack of credible information needed to make sound resource and conservation management decisions.
- Threatened dilution or diminution of park support as populations become increasingly urbanized, technological, and underserved/distant from park experiences. Technology also threatens to shift human focus away from the community and toward the individual: what can be accepted and shared as a member of the community is often rejected as interference with individual aspirations. The battle for the minds of the public will in many ways be key to the future success of parks.
- Heightened competition for shrinking global resources, adding pressure to extract or modify park resources to better serve short-term human needs and goals.
- Fragmentation of natural or cultural lands/landscapes by urbanization.

Roberto Gambino: In a European perspective, the key issues and challenges facing parks and protected areas in managing cultural landscapes and in dealing with local communities may be related to:

- a) the difficult relationship between protection and promotion policies (social sharing of costs and benefits, conflicts between local and global interests and values, conflicts between short and long term expectations...)
- b) the need for the integration of parks in their regional contexts and in the ecological networks,
- c) the growing pluralism of the decision processes for the territorial government and governance.

Elisabeth Hughes: - Notes:

My personal perspective is essentially international rather than UK-based. I would therefore like to respond to this question on both fronts, outlining what I believe to be the wider challenges and key issues before briefly alluding to the situation in England and Wales.

Firstly, however, I believe it is necessary to define what I understand by "*cultural landscapes*" - because there are varying interpretations of the term. I will take as a working definition, that of Prof. Adrian Phillips (1995,) adapted from Taylor (1993):

*Cultural landscapes are the everyday landscapes which surround us. They are the result of human intervention in the natural landscape and present a record of human activity and human values.*¹

A) Wider challenges and key issues:

- i. In terms of the *philosophical challenges*, there is still a need to establish broad consensus across the conservation community that:
 - ❑ acknowledges the inherent relationship between cultural diversity and biodiversity;
 - ❑ appreciates both the intrinsic and use-value of the blend of natural resources, cultural traditions and human land use systems;
 - ❑ regards people as part of nature rather than as against nature;
 - ❑ understands that conservation needs to be underpinned by the concept of sustainable development.
- ii. Protected area managers are inevitably limited in their if they do not have a *supportive legislative and policy context* in which to work; a key issue in managing cultural landscapes and working with local communities, therefore, is that national legislation and policy should reflect the philosophy outlined above.
- iii. Protected areas, whether cultural landscapes or otherwise, need to be incorporated in the national *land-use planning system*, thus reflecting and augmenting their role as part of the wider landscape and facilitating a systems approach to protected area planning. This is perhaps particularly so in the case of cultural landscapes.
- iv. In managing cultural landscapes, protected area authorities need *adequate funding*. The financial demands of "inclusive" management approaches that embrace both cultural and natural resources are considerable. Protected areas are often grossly under-resourced.
- v. In managing cultural landscapes, protected area professionals need a wide range of *management skills*. Scientific specialists are not in themselves sufficient. Managers need a broad base of management skills and expertise that reflect the scope of the demands imposed by what might be termed a "holistic approach".
- vi. Perhaps one of the greatest challenges in the effective management of cultural landscapes is that of the meaningful *participation* of civil society ("communities", NGOs, private enterprise). This is critical for long term sustainability and local acceptance and should apply at all levels of planning and management. While *co- management* is now widely viewed as the way forward for protected areas, the approach can be costly, complex and very time consuming. Perhaps one of the toughest challenges often faced by managers in this regard, is the need to recognize and reconcile many conflicting values, interests and demands within the landscape. Likewise, managers must be willing and able to *build equitable partnerships* and to *share power*.

B) Challenges and key issues - England and Wales

In England and Wales, protected areas comprising cultural landscapes are recognized as IUCN Category V Protected Landscapes². In fact, the 1949 National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act in England and Wales was the first ever piece of legislation to establish a system of protected areas set within a social

¹ Prof. Adrian Phillips (1995) "The Nature of Cultural Landscapes - An IUCN Perspective", paper presented at a UNESCO Conference, Manila, Philippines.

² Definition of Protected Landscape/seascape: "*area of land, with coast and sea as appropriate, where the interaction of people and nature over time has produced an area of distinct character with significant aesthetic, ecological and/or cultural value, and often with high biological diversity. Safeguarding the integrity of this traditional interaction is vital to the protection, maintenance and evolution of such an area*" IUCN 1994.

and economic framework - essentially because on such a small, crowded island, there was no option to set-aside large tracts of land as wilderness. Under national legislation, our Protected Landscapes include primarily National Parks, Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB's) and Heritage Coasts, however, others are now recognized under EU directives (such as Natura 2000) and international programmes such as Man and the Biosphere (UNESCO). The system is complex; management objectives vary; and there are many examples of overlapping designations.

In general terms it's fair to say that national policy and legislation encourage approaches that recognize the concept of cultural landscapes and support the inherent integration of conservation and development.

However, there remain major issues to be addressed and challenges to be met:

1. Fundamentally, the key challenge for our protected area managers is that of reconciling development pressures with the needs of conservation. On a small, densely populated island with limited resources, the development pressures are inevitably considerable. Most protected landscapes in England and Wales, by definition, lie in marginal areas where the demands of local communities for economic development opportunities are understandably great. It is the task of managers to balance the needs of conservation with those of the local economy and society, to ensure a vibrant and healthy landscape with thriving local communities, based upon the principles of sustainability.
2. Some commentators argue that the existing legislation is not strong enough. For example, our National Parks are governed by a complex assemblage of legislation; AONBs fall under the auspices of local government and the priority they are given is highly variable; Heritage Coasts remain essentially a voluntary designation.
3. Government *funding* is a key issue for many. Whilst generally speaking the National Parks in England and Wales have enjoyed consistently good government funding, following devolution in 1999 there has been some inconsistency between the funding of the Parks in England and those in Wales. This is potentially divisive, particularly given that their responsibilities under the legislation are the same. AONB's and Heritage Coasts are funded at the discretion of local government where the priority given is widely variable but often low.
4. *Land ownership*: most of the land our Protected Landscapes is privately owned, with numerous (often small) landowners holding properties therein. It is therefore necessary for the managers to work with the landowners, often through formal management agreements and stewardship schemes, to meet their statutory obligations. In practice, this can be a hugely challenging approach to implement.
5. Linked to 4. above, whilst the communities that live within these areas are recognized as fundamental to the conservation value of the landscape, the effectiveness of local participation in protected area planning and management is variable and many management authorities are still perceived locally as being "top-down" and "dictatorial". Issues of the availability of funding and human resources to enable a greater degree of local participation and co-management; and to facilitate integral processes such as conflict management, consensus building and partnership-building, are important.

Mirek Kundrata: Management of parks and protected areas has prevailing biological backgrounds. Lack of communication skills and economical understanding leads to conflicts between communities seeking for development opportunities and Parks as conservation institutions.

There is still lack of understanding that natural heritage might be a long term basis for local development. Also cultural and natural resources are still understood more as separate values instead as one complementary heritage.

Paul Labovitz: Sprawl, rapid development and expansion of urban and suburban regions, loss of agricultural lands, reduction of available public open space, competition from economic development/short-term political timeframes, no long-term vision for resource protection.

Katri Lisitzin:

- Focusing on a holistic way of managing the cultural values in all landscapes - not only protected ones. The European Landscape Convention, for example, concerns landscapes that might be considered outstanding, as well as, everyday or degraded landscapes.

- Strengthening local awareness. The cultural values are not always shared or identified, neither are politicians and decision makers aware of the role that heritage can - and should - play within rapidly changing economic, social and environmental situations. Finding integrated and alternative ways of establishing a dialogue between the users and the professionals.
- Developing pilot projects where heritage values in the landscape are seen as economic potentials in the development process. Can the development be driven by concern for heritage?
- Developing comprehensive strategies. This implies also moving into a larger integrated framework for management strategies, making connections and arguments at development policy level. Looking at implications, alternatives and consequences of a range of choices. Connecting different parallel administrative and economic systems.

Paolo Perna: At the present time the key issue in the management of protected areas in Italy is the rapid change of cultural landscapes and consequently of the nature that they harbour, caused by the economic decline of many marginal areas.

The decrease of the anthropic pressure on ecosystems is dramatically affecting the composition of many natural communities in such a way that we are not able to foresee completely.

The management of this phenomenon needs that in the next years the protected areas should be able to: Understand the dynamics in progress in the landscape.

Draw up management plans that, also supporting the presence of human population on the territory, encourage the traditional activities that in the past have created the different landscapes.

Start monitoring activities for control and possible corrections of the effects of anthropic activities on landscape.

Lucilla Previati: As they are protected areas in strongly anthropogenic territories, almost all the regional parks in Italy and particularly the Po Delta Park will have to face the following questions in managing their own territories:

- A. The reconstruction of the typical elements of the landscape that have disappeared following intensive farming of the reclaimed land, by restoring hedges and rows of trees and in the less productive areas, reflooding to create water meadows, transition habitats and also brackish marshes towards the coastal area.
- B. The maintenance and upgrading of the marshes used for fishing and the systems by restoring the marsh landscape: the formation of rises within the stretches of water which, as well as making the landscape more picturesque, serve as nesting sites for the birdlife of the delta.

Patrizia Rossi: No doubt that the key issue and challenge for protected areas in Italy and Europe is sustainable development: this means also involvement of local communities in park management, job opportunities for local people offered by park activities, new planning instruments. In Italy an important opportunity has been introduced by law 394/91: this is the so called "Piano socioeconomico", an important planning instrument, together with the new authority for the Park called Comunità del Parco, where all park communities are represented.

Massimo Sargolini: The managing cultural landscape is connected with development local communities. Italian national and regional parks were created in areas more densely inhabited for many hundreds of years. In these areas you can find cultural and natural resources but also problems connected to historical human presence. You can also find historic buildings (castles, strongholds, abbeys), infrastructures, farmhouses and typical cultivation, hotels, camping, industries, general services, ...

Many of these elements, connected with their context, make specific places rich of identity. These values of identity consolidate through growth and evolution.

In this conception, conservation and innovation are strictly tied and the managing cultural resources preserves natural resources too. In fact, the ecologists say the conservation of traditional use of agriculture and other types of working landscapes are important for biodiversity. But, most of these areas are affected by demographic decline and beginning of renaturalisation and re-wilding. So, paradoxically, the lack of local population destroys not only cultural but also natural landscape.

In this way the principal goal is driving local communities to continue work landscape, originating a virtuous circle that presents the follow steps:

- incentive for restoration and maintenance of the natural and cultural landscape;
- strength of the landscape preserved that is worth more and attracts insiders and outsiders;
- possibility of development and decrease of demographic decline;
- restoration and maintenance of the natural and cultural landscape without incentive.

Laura Soullière: "I see as a whole series of issues and causative factors that need to be further addressed:

- population growth, sprawl, and subsequent pressure on any land that can be developed for housing, shopping centers, and the other things we think we need;
- financial pressure caused by sky-rocketing land prices throughout the United States;
- lack of regional planning and zoning; personal property rights in conflict with preservation issues (preservation of landscape, cultural, or historic heritage);
- gentrification of the landscape; ignorance of the long-term financial and cultural benefits of preservation;
- homogenization of American culture and the subsequent impacts on landscape and cultures (McDonald's, Wal-Mart, etc.);
- failure to respect and celebrate diversity of land as well as the diversity of cultures that occupy the land;
- failure to recognize the importance of natural and cultural diversity;
- lack of physical, spiritual and emotional connection with the land and with our cultures;
- dearth of trained park and protected area managers who possess a vision for the future and who recognize the problems confronting parks and protected areas;
- lack of youth mentoring programs and other methods to build toward the future inside and outside our organizations;
- cultural, institutional elitism on the part of us "protectors", when we fail to recognize in all of our zeal that we may not be translating the importance and significance of the resources we protect to the general public;
- frequent agency failure to understand the importance of our local communities and neighbors and how they fit into the equation of resource preservation and protection;
- balancing preservation for the future with appropriate levels of use in parks and protected areas.

Describe one or two protected areas in your country, which, in your view, embody new directions in conservation? What are the key elements that make them effective?

Italian Servizio Conservazione della Natura Delegation: In Italy we have 21 National Parks. Italian Nature Conservation Service policy aim is to achieve a linked development between economy and environment.

Brenda Barrett: The National Park Service oversees 23 congressionally designated National Heritage Areas or Corridors where conservation and interpretation are managed by a partnership of local, state, federal and private entities. These regions include numerous communities where although most of the property is privately owned, the traditional landscape is an important part of the story. Some examples of how heritage areas have tackled the issue of land protection include:

- Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor in Connecticut comprises one of the largest open green spaces between Boston and Washington. To assist local governments and large landowners in preserving this important open space the Corridor has established the Green Valley Institute to educate all parties on land use and conservation options.

- The Cane River National Heritage Area tells the story of the Creole culture in Louisiana. The riverine and plantation landscape is an important part of the story. A project to map and identify the undeveloped land within the area is a high priority project.
- The proposed Crossroads of the Revolution Heritage Area in New Jersey maps Washington's encampments and campaigns in the center of the state. This information will be used to guide the expenditure of public dollars for the acquisition of open space.

Paul Bray: Riverspark or the Hudson Mohawk Urban Cultural Park/Heritage area made up of seven cities, towns and villages at the confluence of the Hudson and Mohawk Rivers, this park/heritage area was the first heritage area in NYS created in 1977 by its member communities. It is now part of the state's system of heritage areas. It is an excellent example of what works and hasn't worked with intergovernmental partnerships.

Romina Cavatassi: I live in Abruzzo (Italy) that is one of the greenest European regions. In that area traditions and popular culture are very strong and important. Some of the local authorities realized or are realizing the importance of involving people in the management of a protected area or park. Indeed they tried or are trying to build up an integrated management system. For instance in the National Park of Abruzzo besides the protected area you can feel a "culturally protected" atmosphere in the villages inside the Park. Consequently besides natural paths interesting in terms of flora and fauna it is possible to make also a cultural visit following cultural paths which include: traditions, local food, local wine and local handicrafts.

Maurilio Cipparone: I think that almost all Italian protected areas are experimenting new directions in conservation. Italian national and regional laws concerning parks, as well as the Italian culture, are more oriented towards "conservation", according to the definition agreed in the WCS, and see the parks also as tools for sustainable development. Just to quote an example, the Monte Rufeno Regional park in Regione Lazio (65 miles north of Rome, at the boundaries with Umbria region) is a good example of "protection" of outstanding natural features, "conservation" of natural resources, sustainable use of the woodlands. All linked to sustainable touristic use of the area and to programs and facilities for training education.

Rolf Diamant:

- Bay Area National Parks. Golden Gate National Parks Association is a model protected area NGO in the US. A major innovator in large-scale volunteerism, private fundraising and regional interpretive outreach.
- Cuyahoga National Park. Particularly Cuyahoga's recently initiated Countryside Initiative, a public/private collaboration to revive and build a more sustainable agriculture sector in the park.
- Blackstone Valley Heritage Area: USNPS Heritage Areas represent some thoughtful approaches to regional landscape strategies based on sustainable tourism, multi-jurisdictional collaboration and carefully targeted NPS technical assistance.

Arthur Eck: Golden Gate National Recreation Area is an outstanding example of the successful use of fundraising and partnerships. Cuyahoga Valley National Park seems to have successfully established a good balance in terms of living landscape, recreational opportunities and natural resource protection. I believe my own park, Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area is an outstanding example of using science to guide and lead resource decision-making in an urbanized setting. It is also a good example of how educational programs are being adapted to meet the needs of both the community as well as the park.

Roberto Gambino: In Italy, as in other European countries, many recent experiences in park management point out new directions in conservation policies (particularly towards the improvement of landscape and identity values and the local sustainable development), not always successful. For example, the Scottish programs ("Working with Scotland people to take care of our natural heritage"), the new program of the Peak NP, UK ("Shaping the future"), many of the plans for the French Regional Parks, some of the plans for the youngest Italian parks (Cilento e Vallo di Diano NP, Alpi Apuane, Monti Sibillini NP and others). Key elements for the effectiveness seem to be the pragmatic attitude and the

managerial capability of the park authorities, as well as the creative involvement of local actors in management policies.

Elisabeth Hughes: The case of the Brecon Beacons National Park (Wales) exemplifies how community participation can be effectively incorporated into management, and an organisational ethos developed which underpins such an approach.

The Park covers some 1344 square kilometres and comprises a cultural landscape of outstanding beauty and diversity. The landscape is very much one of upland agriculture in the north, whilst its southern border fringes the industrial belt of South Wales. To the west, the Park embraces the cultural heartland of Wales; to its east lie the English borderlands. It is home to around 33,000 people, living on isolated farmsteads, in small villages, market towns, and in Brecon itself, with a population of over 7,500. Such diversity presents the National Park Authority with enormous challenges in terms of planning and management. At the same time, it is clear that the local population is a key factor in the landscape and must be central to the work of the Authority if it is to effectively carry out its duties. This is recognised in the current National Park Plan 3

“The continued vitality of the local community, its economy, way of life, culture and language, as well as being desirable in themselves, are essential to the achievement of the National Park Authority’s other purposes.....the NPA’s aim, therefore, is to preserve the viability of local communities, supporting the prosperity of the area with sustainable development and maintaining vitality in a social and cultural balance: in short, making them places in which people wish, and are able, to live”

The Authority’s strategy for achieving this aim focuses strongly on community participation:

“The NPA will encourage the fullest possible local participation in planning and its other activities, and will regard this as an opportunity for wide-ranging discussions. The trend is for the NPA becoming an “enabler”, working with many other organisations in achieving agreed aims. However, there are also many small ways in which the NPA can help local communities or encourage them to help themselves, to improve their settlements or environment” (para. 14.9)

“..... it will increase the involvement of local people, rural development agencies and other interested parties in formulating and implementing National Park plans and policies” (para 14.10); and

“.....the NPA will use its contacts in the community to look for ways in which it can offer help with schemes to benefit both the community and the Park.” (para. 14.11)

This strategy is supported by a number of specific policies that have been implemented through a range of programmes and projects over the period of the Plan. These activities have incorporated participatory techniques such as Planning for Real, Village Design Statements, and Community Appraisals. Information materials have been produced to encourage communities to help themselves to “get involved”⁴. Practical and financial support is also given to numerous community projects, and the Authority works in close partnership with, inter alia, the European LEADER programme and a county Local Agenda 21 initiative, to contribute to the implementation of local projects for the sustainable development of the Park’s communities. The Park’s Education Office has developed schemes of work with local schools which replicate the “adult” participatory exercises – thus has emerged “Sustainability for Real”, raising awareness amongst children of global and local environmental issues, and to generating a sense of collective responsibility for the local area.

The strategies and policies laid out in the Management Plan enable the Authority to work closely and effectively with its communities on a co-management basis. Through such activities, the culture of participation has come to permeate much of its broader work programme. Its fundamental approach is to integrate local people into management as much as possible and to offer them a strong sense of ownership of their National Park.

³ Brecon Beacons National Park Committee (1993) Brecon Beacons National Park Plan, Third Edition

⁴ for example: Brecon Beacons National Park Authority (1996) "Your Place Your Future: An Ideas Pack for Community Projects"

Mirek Kundrata: The White Carpathians UNESCO Biosphere Reserve. Mountains on the borders between Slovakia and the Czech Republic. Protected Area is rich not only in biodiversity (mainly orchid meadows), but also in landscape patterns and scenery, and also local culture.

Management of Protected Area started to understand complexity of those values and shifted their focus from exclusively biological approach into working with landowners, communities and small entrepreneurs. Management uses local NGOs both for managing part of protected areas, for communication with local partners, and for implementing new techniques and ideas of landscape conservation and management.

The Broumovsko Landscape Protected Area (NE Bohemia – on the Polish border). Area is former Sudetenland, with secondary, not rooted population. Director of the Park started to work from cultural side. He is very active in heritage revitalization; he cooperates with Church and local cultural clubs on renewal of historic monuments as well as semi-forgotten traditions. The Park administration became a leading force in formulation development vision of the region, and it is paid back by getting respect from local population and authorities.

Paul Labovitz: The Cuyahoga Valley National Park coupled with the Ohio & Erie Canal National Heritage Corridor is great examples of new directions in conservation, preservation and recreation. Both places rely on developing partnerships with both like-minded and non-traditional partners to define common goals and work together to make it happen. A key element is the search for non-traditional partners who do have issues in common and a stake in the outcome. Another key element is the conservation community improving their ability to articulate the benefits of conservation in economic terms rather than just somewhat intangible/feel-good values.

Katri Lisitzin:

- ICCROM, being an international organization has possibilities of linking experiences of effective management worldwide. The focus is not explicitly on cultural landscapes but the good management of all landscapes.
- Cinque Terre in Italy (World Heritage Site) is one of the pilot projects in ICCROM's current activities with Territorial Conservation. Its management illustrates local efforts and community-based participation in searching for continuity of land-use and, consequently, the survival of the identity and character of the place.

Paolo Perna: During the last decade it has become clear that in Italy, like in all Europe, the main conservation problem is the protection of the areas used for traditional cultivation and grazing. Also the parks have to face this problem and most of their activities, in the last years, have been directed towards the conservation of natural heritage through the maintaining of an adequate population level in rural areas. A good example could be the Sibillini National Park where, since nearly all the territory has been used by man for more than two thousands years, the conservation of traditional activities is the only way to preserve the natural resources.

Some of the key actions of the Park have been:
promotion of the ecotourism, to encourage the creation of an integrative income for local populations, allowing their permanence on the territory.
Promotion of typical products like the “pecorino”, a sheep’s milk cheese whose production allows the maintaining of grazing activity.
Realization of museum structures where interrelations between traditional activities and natural heritage might be shown.

Lucilla Previati: Through the possibilities offered by the EU financing programmes such as “LIFE NATURA”: In the Po Delta Park the following have been realised:

- A. Digging out canals again to restore the kindness of the water both in the “piallasse” (shallow coastal wetlands) of Ravenna and in the inland freshwater marshes of Campotto di Argenta; the restoration of circulating water allows life to return to the stretches of water.
- B. Clearing up overhead electric cables in the entire Park (340 km of overhead electric cables), by burying them and using dissuading “spiral elements” or “helicord” cables will reduce the number of

deaths of the most common species of birdlife and at the same time conserve the presence of a high level of fauna.

Patrizia Rossi: Some good example in Italy and Europe:

Sibillini National Park (I: work with local tourism business)

System of protected areas of the Po River (I, agreement on cooperation and planning)

Alpi Marittime (I) and Mercantour (F) for transfrontier cooperation

La Garrotxa (Spain) and the Broads (Uk) (Work with local tourism business and local communities...

Massimo Sargolini: For many years the goal was mere conservation of natural and cultural resources. In fact, since 1939, have issued specific laws: some of these for conservation of aesthetic resources and other ones for conservation of ecological resources. At last, the park plan, introduced in Italy with national law number 394, passed on the 6th of December 1991, points out several objectives:

- conservation and valorisation of the natural, cultural, anthropological, historical and architectural resources;
- to promote agricultural and forest traditional activities;
- to promote didactic and scientific research activities;
- to promote productive activities compatible with environment.

The new goal is connecting landscape conservation with landscape planning. Actually, if we define landscape as an “area as perceived by people, whose character is the result of the action and interaction of natural and/or human factors”, we have to consider the traditional activities and their coherent evolution, in order to maintain their fitness to the specific qualities of places. The conservation needs plan. The landscape becomes resource for the plan and conservation is connected to development.

Some Italian protected areas are going in this way. In particular, I’m describing the situation in Sibillini National Park and in Sasso Simone e Simoncello Regional Park. They are two parks in the centre of Italy. The first (700 km², 17 municipalities) is in the middle of Apennine Range; the second (49 Km², 5 municipalities) is situated between the Apennine Range and the Adriatic Sea. In the Sibillini national Park, according to park plan, a lot of projects are sailing to organize the new use of typical farms, pasture lands and wood, historic infrastructures and buildings. For instance, a project called “Grande Anello dei Sibillini” (Big Ring of Sibillini”) makes a pedestrian ring connected with a cycle and an equestrian ring, with the support of historic footpaths, typical farmhouse, and neglected and isolated buildings. Another project, called “Valorizzare il carbone” (“Emphasizing coal”) provides: the restoration of old charcoal pits with remake of charcoal pile; the transformation of coal cellar in coal-museum; the draw of a book (that deals with the way of coal burning, the life of charcoal burner); the organization of didactic pedestrian footpaths to know the old activities connected to the coal; the organization of modern ways of coal producing and coal commerce.

In the Sasso Simone e Simoncello Regional Park, according to the park plan, are sailing a lot of projects that provide to drive the evolution of historical landscape promoting the use of original fruit-bearing plant. Beyond, is developed typical local production with quality trademark.

Laura Soullière: The National Heritage Area program is one of the most important developments in landscape preservation in the last 17 years. A National Heritage Area has “natural, cultural, historic and scenic resources that combine to form a cohesive, nationally distinctive landscape arising from patterns of human activity shaped by geography.” The U.S. Congress creates heritage areas through legislation, which gives general direction and guidance to the areas. A heritage area is a distinct geographic area with a strong sense of place formed by its natural and cultural significance. The federal government is only a partner in the heritage area, and its place is usually one of providing technical assistance when asked, seed money for grants-in-aid, and similar services. The success of the Heritage Area program lies in its basis as a grassroots effort, where local people are the driving force in preserving those things of significance to them. As a result, they contribute an emotional attachment and lifetime commitment to the heritage area resources that is far greater than anything the federal government could ever provide. Thus, the continued involvement people whose traditions helped shaped the landscape of that heritage area enhances the

significance of the area. The resources are preserved, and their preservation comes from a home-based effort of those whose ancestors may have originally shaped them.

Cane River National Heritage Area, in which the national park that I manage is located, serves as an example. A tremendous boon that comes with this grassroots effort is the strength it pours back into the cultures that participate. Here, for instance, a small amount of federal funding for one ethnographic project resulted in a phenomenal interest in local people recording their own cultural traditions and oral history. Prior to the advent of the Heritage Area and this project funding, most had not considered what they see as their daily lives as being noteworthy. One project began a landslide of information gathering and a resurrection of cultural pride.

How do you envision international exchange contributing to these new directions in conservation?

Italian Servizio Conservazione della Natura Delegation: A partnership programme and international exchange of experiences could be very useful to build new expertise. We also think that all this will provide practical assistance for the development of international collaborations between protected areas from different countries.

Brenda Barrett: In general it has not been the mission of the National park Service to preserve living landscapes where inhabitants still farm, hunt, log or exploit natural resources in a traditional manner. Parks and their adjacent lands have a clear and distinct boundary: no people live on one side of the line; people live on the other side of the line. European Parks are often more integrated into the landscape with a patchwork of public and private lands. Exchanges between countries could explore these different approaches to conservation. Topics to be explored could include regional interpretation, sustainable economic development, and achieving community support. These are important issues for the success of the National Heritage Areas program.

Paul Bray: What is new for the USA in integrating conservation/recreation and sustainable development in inhabited areas is the basic condition in most of the rest of the world. In addition, nations like Italy have a much more developed and refined urbanistic notion that is necessary for the protection and management of cultural landscapes. Europe is taking the lead when it comes to European wide efforts at cultural landscape management.

Romina Cavatassi: Protected areas, all over the world, are subject to many pressures as stated before. They need skilled management, well-trained, experienced and motivated staff. A partnership programme and an exchange of expertise could be a very useful tool to span the globe, draw together a host of experiences and build new expertise. As well as to spread examples of good practice and to provide practical assistance for the development of international collaborations between protected areas from different countries with different landscape, traditions and socio economic characteristics.

Maurilio Cipparone: Parks cannot be seen as islands within the countries they belong to: this is true also at international level. Following the proposals made with the Pan European Biodiversity and Landscape Diversity Strategy (PEBLDS); in Europe there is an attempt to transform the “islands” in some kind of a continental network. International co-operation is essential to achieve this result and all international efforts (see IUCN-WCPA programs) are going towards this direction.

Rolf Diamant:

- Develop ways to continually share and evaluate partnership experiences and new models for sustainable landscape practice.
- Expand training opportunities for park and protected area employees, partners and other conservation professionals that specifically focus on making partnerships work.

Arthur Eck:

- Protected areas in the United States appear to lag far behind in understanding the possibilities of and effectively managing areas where human beings are part of the landscape.

- There is a growing need for scientific information as a basis for park management decisions. In many cases, there are comparative ecosystems around the world where researchers and park managers could combine and compare results. This would likely result in better science at less cost and with benefits to a much broader global park community.
- Urbanization and greater demand for park resources threaten parks globally. At the same time, parks form part of the ecological or green infrastructure that has uncalculated value to their societies, in terms of such things as the ability of trees to scrub pollutants from the air. A concentrated effort to understand the economics of these ecological systems has global significance in terms of why any and all parks deserve and require protection. At the same time, a better scientific understanding of what are the critical elements of functional green infrastructure systems also needs to be attained. For example, how many highways can cross a wildlife corridor before it ceases to function as such.
- There is a growing public expectation of governments to perform efficiently and effectively. One of the proven best ways of doing this is by a methodical evaluation from park system to park system of best management practices. Efforts could be undertaken to study successful park strategies, and share relevant factors contributing to success with other park agencies.

Roberto Gambino: International exchange of knowledge and experience may substantially contribute to developing new directions in conservation policies, stimulating the comparison and renewal of the cultural attitudes, fostering the networking of parks and agencies, promoting scientific advancements.

Elizabeth Hughes:

- ◆ Providing training opportunities in new management skills and approaches
- ◆ Promoting, and offering training in participatory approaches for the involvement of local people in protected area management
- ◆ Raising the profile and disseminating the message of the new directions
- ◆ Facilitating the wider sharing of knowledge and experiences
- ◆ Offering a platform for debate on different conservation ideologies

Mirek Kundrata: Very important. Brings new trends, motivation, working modules. Especially examples empowering integrity of cultural and natural heritage in managing our landscapes are valuable.

Paul Labovitz: We all have much to learn from each other. The different perspective gained from working in another country is a fresh look at new approaches to solve problems and make conservation work. Each agency has strengths and weaknesses. I find it amazing to see what a country can do with limited financial resources (Slovakia) and learn a lot from the innovation that is required to get anything accomplished. We also have much to learn about the science of protected areas.

Katri Lisitzin:

- Capacity building through learning of experiences
- Improving the information, coordination and implementation of funding mechanisms and large-scale projects on local level.
- Disseminating successful case studies and supporting in searching and exploring alternative solutions. Case studies in different phases of management implementation can serve as examples in evaluating indirect and long-term effects of change
- Strengthening the local awareness through external support and interest
- Learning from the implementation of different national and regional policies

Paolo Perna: Through exchange of experiences, in particular in:

- involving local communities in the conservation of cultural landscape;
- using sustainable development for cultural landscape conservation;
- training of technicians capable of dealing with problems of conservation and management of landscape.

Lucilla Previati: The interventions already started, and the experiences, even if they are negative, carried out with the local populations, become elements of knowledge for managing the territory that are useful in

other similar situations. Knowing about works already done or the mistakes of others serves to improve your own situation.

Patrizia Rossi: Thematic workshops, and seminars, staff exchange, common programs and direct partnerships between protected areas. A partnership scheme working very well has been tested by the EUROPARC Federation with the Partnership & Exchange Program, between protected areas in Europe and Latin America and Asia. This could be easily adapted for an US/Europe partnership program.

Massimo Sargolini: Participating in the US Embassy International Visitor Program 1999, I noticed exchange experience between American Park system and Italian Park contributes to these new directions in conservation. It should be interesting organizing international exchange in three different ways:

- a) study exchange for European and American students that with their course of study are oriented towards protected areas;
- b) research exchange for researchers in different subjects interested by protected areas (biology, geology, architecture, town-planning, sociology and economics);
- c) exchange experiences of managing protected areas for functionaries and superintendents of protected areas and government official.

Laura Soullière:

- Share ideas about traditional methods of conservation, and new methods of conservation on a worldwide basis.
- Study whether private/government ventures or straight government ventures in landscape preservation tend to be more successful.
- Establish a professional exchange program among countries interested in participating. Include the governmental bodies that manage parks and protected areas, and other parties with vested interests in landscape preservation (here, for instance, the Trust for Public Lands, the Nature Conservancy, the Archeological Conservancy, various heritage areas, and of course the Conservation Study Institute).
- Link international parties into existing professional meetings that provide forums for discussions of landscape and resource preservation (the George Wright Society, ICOMOS, etc.)
- Develop a guidebook with examples of successfully protected landscapes. Include the background on each project with information about political background and cultural issues as well as the resources protected.

What do you think should be the strategic priorities for cooperation between Europe and the US in this area over the next 3 – 5 years?

Italian Servizio Conservazione della Natura Delegation: Some strategic priorities could include:

- applying science and technology to the managing of Parks (biodiversity conservation using GIS)
- promoting environmental education
- considering parks as a network rather than “islands”
- exchanging and twinning themes concerning “Mountain project 2002”

Brenda Barrett: Some strategic priorities could include:

- Identifying difference and similarities in community and landscape conservation initiatives.
- Sharing information on tourism management, regional signage and interpretation and eminence of quality and authenticity.
- Measuring economic sustainability and defining success in the preservation of traditional life ways.

Paul Bray:

- a. Twinning or partnering parks and protected areas
- b. Training programs such as the USNPS and the Glynwood Center offered for managers in the Carpathian Mountains.
- c. Training in system management for the INCS from NPS
- d. Professional exchanges

Romina Cavatassi: I think the strategic priorities should be implemented on the basis of the weakness before outlined:

- Exchange of experience and expertise in order to get trained and motivated on the basis of different background;
- Promoting an exchange program emphasizing the importance of education and community participation;
- Setting up guidelines regarding how to deal with local people: consensus building and conflicts solving;
- Promoting and pushing program funds at international level emphasizing also the importance of global benefits reachable in terms of biodiversity conservation and carbon sequestration.
- Setting up a program to geographically reference protected areas by the use of GIS on the basis of which many other research including socio economic characteristics and cultural one can be carried out.

Maurilio Cipparone: I do not think that it might be possible to identify a priority which may be the same for all the European countries and for all European Protected Areas. However, it might happen that some topic might be shared, in terms of priority, among several countries. For what it concerns Italy, strategic priorities might be the sharing of experiences in:

“Strategic planning”, in “management planning,” and in identifying “management policies”, as implemented in the NPS;

In the evaluation of the economic benefits of the Protected Areas, (somehow adapting to our reality the “MGM” experimented in the US parks);

In interpretation-interpretation activities and planning- (interpretation is a discipline almost unknown in Italy, in the Universities, in the Parks and in the Ministry);

In training, for Protected Areas staff, included training and education opportunities for promoting and implementing stewardship.

I think that the most strategic priority we could have is how to “export” not the US realities, but the US NPS “methods”. Well-rooted methods, in fact, are the missing element in the Italian Pas system and management.

Rolf Diamant:

- Multi-sector exchanges focusing strengthening NGO capacity and public/ private partnerships and initiatives.
- Building educational capacity in schools and universities focusing on stewardship and sustainability through partnerships with parks and protected areas.

Arthur Eck: Shared research projects, designed to take advantage of comparative studies for parks in many nations.

Roberto Gambino: The strategic priorities for cooperation between Europe and the US in this field should concern, in my view:

- a) the circulation of information on management planning, policies and practices, taking into account the lack of information structures and channels at the pan-European level (there is nothing equivalent to the National Park Service; and the experience of our European Centre on Nature Park Planning clearly shows that each park authority generally knows very little about what is done by other authorities, even in the same country and for the same purpose);

b) the initiatives for scientific and cultural comparison and exchange, aiming to foster the cross fertilization of the learning processes and bringing out the diversity of research experiences, cultural traditions and scientific approaches.

Elisabeth Hughes:

- ◆ Facilitate joint training courses / workshops / symposia for protected area staff
- ◆ Build international partnerships between protected areas (cultural landscapes)
- ◆ Provide for relevant and appropriate exchanges of protected area staff
- ◆ Promote and facilitate the twinning of "communities" associated with protected areas (cultural landscapes)

Mirek Kandrata:

- Focus on land stewardship models and techniques how to involve local population into business of nature protection.
- Focus on evaluating economic benefit of preserving heritage and using it for sustainable development of protected areas.

Paul Labovitz: Make it easier to work together. Currently the ability of US NPS staff to participate in international assignments is a bit saddled with bureaucracy and high-grading (only well-connected folks get to go).

Set some goals collectively so we can work on issues that are important to both "sides" rather than what we think each other needs. Case in point was the US Peace Corps helping get a GIS database for a Polish NP when the park really needed basic interpretive and public information materials. Don't overwhelm people with technology, find out what they really need and want then work together to find it.

Get some funding in-place for the activities and find sources outside our usual places so we are not perceived as taking money from the parks.

Katri Lisitzin:

- Developing working methods for exchange of experiences in management of landscapes. Finding training methodologies for capture and re-use of the experiences, for evaluating the most useful references.
- Developing joint training initiatives in the management of heritage values. Identifying key skills for managers, ways of balancing theory and practice and promoting a cross-sectorial approach.

Federico Niccolini: The mutual understanding process can stimulate innovations and implementations in several technical fields, particularly the cooperation could be focused on the:

- creation of a cluster of performance indicators to be internationally recognized;
- identification of the most effective management and strategic principles;
- analysis of the benchmark realities for the correct role of management.

After the recent position assumed by the US Government on the Kyoto Protocol, the European Union play a role of guide in the *sustainable development strategies* for all the world. US should investigate the programs, the conventions and the interventions developed by the European Commission, (particularly by the Environment Directorate General) and by the European Council (particularly by the Environment and Sustainable Development Directorate). On the other side, most of the European countries should deeply investigate the US systemic models of management of protected areas and the frequent links among NGOs and public organization in the field of the conservation of natural and cultural resources.

US and European partners should jointly develop programs and interventions for Africa, Asia, South and Central America, inspiring to some of the interesting activities developed by international organizations or NGOS (such as ICCROM's *Africa 2009*, the Caribbean and Latin America Division of the Nature Conservancy...).

Paolo Perna: To develop predictive models and monitoring systems that can help in managing the complex and rapid changes occurring in cultural landscape.

Lucilla Previati: In the immediate forthcoming future co-operation between Europe and the US could develop around the following themes:

- Managing the “Water” resource”.
- Environmental education programmes
- Pilot projects for restoring and/or innovative large-scale interventions to enhance the landscape.

Patrizia Rossi: Strategic topics: sustainable development, wildlife management, bioregional approach, systems of protected areas and corridors, nature and culture, benefits beyond the boundaries....

Through: training activities for manager and staff, thematic exchange and common programs.

Massimo Sargolini: The international exchange should be oriented to connect specific cases of study, searching common issues that become strategic priorities for cooperation Europe - USA.

In the last few years, we noticed not all the American protected territories could be comparable to the historic national park where we find big ecosystems (sea, rivers, marshes, glaciers, coasts, lowlands, mountains, deserts, forests, plants, flowers and animals) without man interference. In the Northeast of U.S.A. we can see portions of territory identifiable like heritage areas, where the interaction of physical features, natural processes, cultural traditions and economic and social forces have created distinctive patterns of human settlement that have shaped the landscape over time. In some area of the east Mississippi-Missouri (like Chesapeake Bay,), there is a strong concentration of problems due to the presence of natural resources (fauna habitat, river vegetation, wooded areas,), cultural landscape and intense human activities (residential, agricultural, industrial, commercial) at the same time. This fact causes significant interference and conflicts in relationships. For this case, near enough to typical European situations, the "Chesapeake bay critical area commission" that, in cooperation with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency representing the Federal Government, the District of Columbia, the State of Maryland, the Commonwealths of Pennsylvania and Virginia, faces problems concerning protection and ecosystem balance of that area.

In order to plan these areas, like in European protected areas, it's necessary searching complex cases. These cases introduce new valuational disciplines, most of them proper to economic and social sciences. In these cases there are likeness with Italian or European experiences and it is possible to exchange knowledge between two countries, beginning cooperation.

Laura Soullière:

- Establish a mission based on the consolidated suggestions.
- Develop additional formal commitments from interested parties.
- Complete the programs, and most importantly share the results of the programs and studies through presentation of professional papers, publication and dissemination of information to the public.

Do you think that the IUCN classification for protected areas could be implemented?

Italian Servizio Conservazione della Natura Delegation: Considering IUCN classification of protected areas, the Italian one's can be identified according to the differences of their goals:

- national parks closer to the American model, that is much nature less anthropic pressure
- national parks aiming the protection of wilderness areas
- wildlife reserves aiming conservation of the species

Paul Bray: IUCN classifications are a useful framework.

Romina Cavatassi: I think it is a good classification though probably a more comprehensive area including all different elements could be introduced.

Maurilio Cipparone: I do not understand the question. I think that it is difficult to find a common international rule to be followed, given the very different situations. As a member of the European WCPA Steering Committee I think that the existing classification takes in account sufficiently the differences. Maybe we should find some new method for “recognising” at international level the quality and the effectiveness of the management and therefore ink the implementation of the classification to some “fringe” benefit or incentives. Perhaps this might be possible at European level, using properly the EU directives and financial programs.

Rolf Diamant: Good conceptual framework but there are practical limitations for application in the US at the present time.

Arthur Eck: I have only a basic understanding of this classification system. I don't think my opinion on the matter is to be particularly trusted. The American system is confusing and has no systematic method to it.

Roberto Gambino: The implementation of IUCN protected area classification in Europe comes up against a number of well known problems and difficulties and many, largely unsuccessful attempts have been made to solve them. The basic consideration concerns the extreme diversification among the classifications adopted by European countries, rooted in the diversity of the environmental, historical, cultural, institutional, social and economic contexts, but also reflecting the lack of an effective European policy for parks and protected areas. Such diversification makes hardly comparable the protection measures, the management objectives and the actual policies that each country (or even each region inside a country) defines for each protected area category. It makes it difficult to harmonize and coordinate protection and promotion policies above all in trans-national areas, such as the Alpine system (see the Espace Mont Blanc) or the Danubian river floodplain. So, we cannot avoid the problem of the harmonization of the diverse European classifications, in order to make them comparable each other and with the classifications adopted at the international level. In this direction, the IUCN classification may be the basis for building a common matrix of classification criteria, not canceling the richness of the national diversities. Some attempts are being made for that.

Elisabeth Hughes: Globally this system of classification is widely recognised and implemented even though terminologies vary enormously. Certainly, there are advantages in doing so, for example it:

- provides international uniformity of management guidelines;
- offers a framework for a wide range of protected area types and facilitates national / regional / global representativeness of protected area systems;
- facilitates common understanding; information exchange; and good practice guidance.

Mirek Kundrata: Yes, in principle it can be implemented. But personally I think it is not that important. More important is to implement wise resource use also in non-protected areas.

Paul Labovitz: I am not such a big fan of systems, classifications, criteria, etc. Each nation should have the ability to develop a system of protected areas that suits them best and not be forced to conform to a system that might just reflect the least common denominator that was agreed by a collection of policy folks who may or may not spend much time in the field working with real resources. Any process that spends more time and money on paper, forms and bureaucracy is not what is needed. That said, perhaps I do not understand the IUCN system and should learn more about it

Federico Niccolini: The IUCN classifications are the most effective tool to conceptualize PA. Each kind classification needs anyway to be continuously reviewed. The PA concept is also relatively recent and it is continuously influenced by many socio-economic dynamics. The future socio-economic scenarios affect the concept of PA, assigning more relevance to the PA nets, to the conservation strategies outside the parks' boundaries and to the joint conservation strategies developed by the non-profit and the public organizations. PA classifications need to be ready to take into account those evolving models. Probably the best solution will be to keep the actual classifications and create parallel classifications.

Paolo Perna: Yes I do, but it is important to consider that in many countries it is impossible to distinguish between conservation of nature, of landscape and of human traditional activities.

Patrizia Rossi: IUCN-WCPA together with EUROPARC provided a set of Guidelines for interpretation and application of IUCN categories in Europe. I believe that IUCN classification can be (should be) implemented differently in a different context.

Massimo Sargolini: I think that the problem is not to implement or not to implement, but it is finding a flexible schedule that could be able to link to the very different variety of parks in the world.

Laura Soullière: I believe the IUCN classification for protected areas could be implemented. Politics plays such a strong role in the success of the program, however, that the collaborative management approach presented in some of the IUCN literature may provide the best outcomes. Also an irrational

paranoia exists in certain quarters of the United States concerning any global programs because of a perceived threat of “one-world government.” This paranoia causes visionary ideas – such as an international collection of sustainable, protected areas – to falter.

What do you think should be the highest strategic priority for cooperation between the Italian "Servizio Conservazione della Natura" and the US National Park Service over the next 3 years?

Italian Servizio Conservazione della Natura Delegation: The highest strategic priority for cooperation between the INCS and US NPS should be indicating the procedures and the useful initiatives which could have a profitable mutual implementation from one context to the other.

Brenda Barrett: The highest strategic priority for my program area is to better understand the model of the lived in viable landscapes to improve the program development and possibilities of the National Heritage Areas initiative and the preservation of landscapes outside the National Park system.

Paul Bray: The highest priority should be considering tools and techniques for system management in Italy and heritage/cultural landscape management for NPS

Romina Cavatassi: I think it could be important to study together and exchange ideas and expertise on how to strengthen protected areas referring to their different elements, organize seminars and workshop, finding way of financing or self financing by involving local people.

Maurilio Cipparone: See above (point 4).

Rolf Diamant:

- Park and protected area management and leadership training.
- Landscape stewardship through partnership arrangements and working with communities.
- Sustainable development and cultural heritage tourism, (for example US programs on conservation inn keepers, Italian agritourism value-added products and regional marketing).
- Technical exchange on the interface of natural and cultural resources, interpretation, education for sustainability, GIS, biodiversity conservation, and application of science and technology to park management.
- Our shared conservation legacy of George Perkins Marsh and exploration of his concepts of stewardship for today.

Arthur Eck:

- Comparisons of best management practices.
- Comparative scientific research.

Roberto Gambino: The same may be said about the cooperation between the Italian Servizio Conservazione Natura and the US National Park Service. Of course, on the Italian side there are some specificities (such as the complex intertwining of natural and cultural values) that are to be well considered in such cooperation.

Federico Niccolini: The learning experience can be beneficial for both the Institutions. The highest priority for the Italian *Servizio Conservazione della Natura* should be the investigation of the *National Park Service* organizational model, trying to identify the organizational solutions that can improve the effectiveness of the Italian National Park system. Regarding the NPS, I believe that the attention should be primarily addressed to the investigation of the most effective Italian *cases study* of parks' strategies particularly effective in catalyzing the economic interests of local communities and of specific categories of stakeholders according with the parks' institutional goals.

Paolo Perna: An exchange of experiences about creation and management of a “system” of protected areas.

Patrizia Rossi: The same as above. In particular: use of new technologies for monitoring and management (GIS); Twinning between protected areas having ecological and/or social similarities.

Massimo Sargolini: The National Park Service has a long experience of managing protected areas and was able to organize an American park system. The Italian “Servizio Conservazione della Natura” is younger and hasn’t organized an Italian Park system yet, but it accumulated other knowledge of relationship between protected areas and private property.

So, the Italian “Servizio Conservazione della Natura” can learn from American experience especially about:

- the organization of a central structure for planning;
- the coordination of Geographic Information System;
- the divulgation of enterprises for public enjoyment;
- the central organization of public enjoyment structures;
- the rule of NGO;

The National Park Service can learn from Italian experience especially about:

- the problems that arise from interference between human (non only historic) components and natural components;
- the problems that arise from drawing and planning private property.

Laura Soullière: Complete a comparative analysis of the landscape conservation methods in the two countries and include traditional and new, non-traditional methods. Analyze the successes and failures based on outcomes, if possible. Include information on the roles of government, non-government entities, and private citizens in the processes. Include information on the legal vehicles used for landscape preservation.

Are there any other points you would like to make?

Paul Bray: In the future we should build on the accomplishment of recent years and be as inclusive as possible in making new plans.

Romina Cavatassi: I just would like to emphasize the importance of Global Environmental Benefits reachable from parks and protected areas besides the local benefits.

Maurilio Cipparone: Yes, just a question. After more than thirty years of involvement in conservation, I still do not understand why it is so difficult to work for parks, nature, and environment. Maybe the sociologists you have some answer?

Roberto Gambino: Another question which is receiving a growing attention in Europe, strictly tied to the theme of the Workshop, concerns of course the relationship between the nature conservation and the landscape management, with special reference to the recently signed European Landscape Convention, provided by the Council of Europe.

Elisabeth Hughes: The International Centre for Protected Landscapes has as its focus what we call the “protected landscape approach”. Drawn from the IUCN Category V Protected Landscape concept, it is a management model, the goal of which is to safeguard and enhance the diversity of biological and cultural resources within viable programmes of social and economic development. We argue that the approach is applicable both to a wide range of protected areas - and nowhere more so than in the management of cultural landscapes - but also to the rural landscape as a whole, for which it offers a model approach for sustainability.

Paul Labovitz: My work has focused on central European conservation. I think a priority for this work is to continue to work at getting people from both sides together so a network of individuals can be formed to facilitate information exchange. Email is a wonderful tool but nothing beats face-to-face opportunities to work together. The Countryside Exchange at the Glynwood Center, the Quebec-Labrador Foundation Stewardship Exchange Program and others like it are great ways to build a cadre of experienced professionals at the field level who are working with international partners to help make the world smaller. We should involve our European (and other continents as well) in as many of our conferences as possible (Rails to Trails, George Wright Society, Land Trust Alliance etc.). I also think that the kind of assistance

that the NPS Rivers & Trails Program provides is a great match at helping people organize and define their needs, develop a strategic plan and work at implementing a shared vision for a community or region.

Katri Lisitzin: The integration of the natural and cultural sector's priorities and policies is still an urgent issue. The nature (conservation) seeks balance - the culture dynamism. Subsequently communication is a key skill of a manager. In this US and Europe can share working methodologies and practical experiences in awareness building and governance related to environmentally sustainable planning.

Federico Niccolini: To investigate tools to finance international cooperation programs.

Lucilla Previati: To develop acquaintances to get the local population more involved in the daily management of the naturalistic features of their territory.

With regard to this, in Europe the recent "European Convention of the Landscape" signed at Florence in October by the members of the Council of Europe, makes local populations responsible to the international community for the conservation of environmental assets.

Patrizia Rossi: I'm happy to share thoughts and experience with US colleagues!

Massimo Sargolini: I'd like to go into a matter that represents a likeness between Italian and American countries: the re-naturalization. It is becoming a big problem for both countries, particularly, in Italy it is going to destroy and hide traces of Roman and Medieval civilization. I think that also in America it is a problem, because, in some places, the re-wilding could destroy traces of native population: isn't the true?

Laura Soullière: Interpretation and education are tools that all countries must use to assist in the preservation of our world's significant, distinctive landscapes.